arXiv:1209.1083v2 [math.RT] 6 Sep 2012

DIMENSIONS OF IRREDUCIBLE MODULES OVER W-ALGEBRAS AND GOLDIE RANKS

IVAN LOSEV

Abstract. The main goal of this paper is to compute two related numerical invariants of a primitive ideal in the universal enveloping algebra of a semisimple Lie algebra. The first one, very classical, is the Goldie rank of an ideal. The second one is the dimension of an irreducible module corresponding to this ideal over an appropriate finite W-algebra. We concentrate on the integral central character case. We prove, modulo a conjecture, that in this case the two are equal. Also, modulo the same conjecture, we compute certain scale factors introduced by Joseph, this allows to compute the Goldie ranks of the algebras of locally finite endomorphisms of a simple in the BGG category. Our conjecture asserts that there is a one-dimensional module over the W-algebra with certain additional properties. The conjecture is proved for the classical types. This completes a program of computing Goldie ranks proposed by Joseph in the 80's.

We also provide an essentially Kazhdan-Lusztig type formula for computing the characters of the irreducibles in the Brundan-Goodwin-Kleshchev category O for a W-algebra again under the assumption that the central character is integral. The formula is based on a certain functor from an appropriate parabolic category O to the W-algebra category O. This functor can be regarded as a generalization of functors previously constructed by Soergel and by Brundan-Kleshchev. We prove a number of properties of this functor including the quotient property and the double centralizer property.

We develop several topics related to our generalized Soergel functor. For example, we discuss its analog for the category of Harish-Chandra bimodules. We also discuss generalizations to the case of categories O over Dixmier algebras. The most interesting example of this situation comes from the theory of quantum groups: we prove that an algebra that is basically Lusztig's form of a quantum group at a root of unity is a Dixmier algebra. For this we check that the quantum Frobenius epimorphism splits.

Dedicated to Tony Joseph, on his 70th birthday.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Primitive ideals and Goldie ranks 2
1.2. W-algebras and their finite dimensional irreducible representations 3
1.3. Results on Goldie ranks 5
1.4. Results on characters of simple $\mathcal{W}$-modules 5
1.5. Organization and content of the paper 7
1.6. Notation and conventions 9
1.7. Acknowledgements 11
2. W-algebras and finite dimensional modules 11
2.1. W-algebras via a slice construction 11
2.2. Functor $\bullet_{\dagger}$ 12

Supported by the NSF grants DMS-0900907, DMS-1161584.
MSC 2010: 17B35, 16G99.

2.3. Classification of finite dimensional irreducible modules 13
2.4. Semisimple HC bimodules 14
2.5. Parabolic induction 15
2.6. Isomorphisms of completions 15
3. Categories 18
3.1. Parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ 18
3.2. Category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$ and Whittaker modules I: non-completed version 19
3.3. Category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$ and Whittaker modules II: completed version 21
4. Generalized Soergel functor 23
4.1. Functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ 23
4.2. Functor $\mathbb{V}$ 27
4.3. Further properties of $\mathbb{V}$ 31
5. Goldie ranks 36
5.1. Reminders on Goldie ranks 36
5.2. Scale factors: Joseph vs Premet 37
5.3. Proof of Theorem 1.3 modulo Conjecture 1.1 38
5.4. Proof of Theorem 1.2 38
6. Supplements 43
6.1. Functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ for Harish-Chandra modules 43
6.2. Another functor $\bullet_{\dagger}$ for $\mathcal{O}^P$ 44
6.3. Dixmier algebras 46
References 50

1. Introduction

1.1. **Primitive ideals and Goldie ranks.** The study of primitive ideals in universal enveloping algebras is a classical topic in Lie representation theory (recall that by a primitive ideal in an associative algebra one means the annihilator of a simple module). It seems that the most interesting case here is when the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ under consideration is semisimple (our base field is always an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic 0). There was a lot of work on primitive ideals for semisimple Lie algebras and related topics in 70's and in 80's (by Barbash, Duflo, Joseph, Lusztig, Vogan, to mention a few authors) that resulted, in particular, in the classification of the primitive ideals. A basic result is a theorem of Duflo that says that any primitive ideal in the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ has the form $J(\lambda) := \operatorname{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})} L(\lambda)$, where $L(\lambda)$ stands for the irreducible highest weight module with highest weight $\lambda - \rho$, as usual ρ denotes half the sum of all positive roots.

One of the classical problems about primitive ideals is to compute their Goldie ranks. Let us recall the definition of the Goldie rank. Take a prime noetherian algebra $\mathcal{A}$. According to the Goldie theorem, there is a full fraction algebra $\operatorname{Frac}(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$. The algebra $\operatorname{Frac}(\mathcal{A})$ is simple and so is the matrix algebra of rank r over some skew-field. The number r is called the Goldie rank of $\mathcal{A}$ and is denoted by $\operatorname{Grk}(\mathcal{A})$. Abusing the notation, by the Goldie rank of a primitive ideal $\mathcal{J}$ of the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U} := U(\mathfrak{g})$ one means the Goldie rank of the quotient $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}$.

There are many results and constructions related to the computation of Goldie ranks due to Joseph, see, in particular, [Jo1]-[Jo4]. Some of them will be recalled in Subsection 5.1. Here we only going to recall one important construction – Joseph's scale factors. Throughout the paper we basically only consider the case of integral central characters, i.e., we restrict ourselves to ideals $J(\lambda)$, where λ is in the weight lattice Λ.

Any integral weight λ can be represented in the form $w\varrho$, where w is an element in the Weyl group, and ϱ is a dominant (integral) weight. This representation is unique if we require that $w\alpha < 0$ for all roots α with $\langle \varrho, \alpha\rangle = 0$ (in this case we say that w and ϱ are compatible).

Consider the algebra $L(L(w\varrho), L(w\varrho))$ of all $\mathfrak{g}$-finite linear endomorphisms of $L(w\varrho)$. According to Joseph, this algebra is prime and noetherian. So one can define its Goldie rank. It turns out that the ratio $\operatorname{Grk}(L(L(w\varrho), L(w\varrho)))\,/\operatorname{Grk}(U(\mathfrak{g})/J(w\varrho))$ does not depend on ϱ as long as ϱ is a dominant integral weight compatible with w. This ratio, Joseph's *scale factor*, is denoted by z_w. It has many interesting properties, for example, it is always an integer.

In [Jo2, 5.5] Joseph proposed a program of computing Goldie ranks. Knowing the scale factors is the first crucial step in this program. The second one is to prove that there are "sufficiently many" completely prime (=of Goldie rank 1) primitive ideals.

There is one easy case here: when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A. Namely, all scale factors equal 1, and there are sufficiently many completely prime ideals, so the problem of computing the Goldie ranks is settled. For recent developments and references here see [Br]. In all other types the problem has been open.

In this paper we are going to state a conjecture, the affirmative answer to which will complete Joseph's program, i.e., will yield both a formula for scale factors and the existence of sufficiently many completely prime primitive ideals (for integral central characters only). Then we will prove the conjecture for the B,C,D types. Also the affirmative answer will provide some kind of formulas for the Goldie ranks. The formula will compute the dimensions of finite dimensional irreducible modules over certain associative algebras known as W-algebras. There is one dimension per each primitive ideal and, in the integral central character case, we will prove that these dimensions coincide with the corresponding Goldie ranks.

1.2. **W-algebras and their finite dimensional irreducible representations.** Now fix a nilpotent orbit $\mathbb{O}$. From the data of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathbb{O}$ one can construct an associative algebra $\mathcal{W}$ called a *finite W-algebra* (below we omit the adjective "finite"). The properties of $\mathcal{W}$ we need will be recalled in Sections 2,3. For now we will only need to know two things regarding W-algebras.

One is a result obtained in [Lo2] and describing a relationship between the sets $\operatorname{Pr}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})$ of all primitive ideals $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{U}$ with associated variety $\operatorname{V}(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J})$ equal to $\overline{\mathbb{O}}$ and the set $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})$ of all finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules. The component group $A(= A(e))$ of the centralizer of $e \in \mathbb{O}$ in the adjoint group $\operatorname{Ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts on $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})$. This action is induced from a certain reductive group action on $\mathcal{W}$ by algebra automorphisms. It turns out that there is a natural identification of the orbit space $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})/A$ with $\operatorname{Pr}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})$. Moreover, in [LO] the author and V. Ostrik have computed the stabilizers in A of irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules. We will need some details regarding this computation to state the main results of the present paper so let us recall them now.

Recall, see, for example, [Lu1], that the Weyl group W of $\mathfrak{g}$ splits into the union of subsets called two-sided cells. There is a bijection between the two-sided cells in W and certain nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$ called *special.* This bijection sends $\mathbf{c}$ to the dense orbit in the associated variety $\operatorname{V}(\mathcal{U}/J(w\varrho))$, where $w \in \mathbf{c}$ and ϱ is regular dominant. Until further notice we will assume that $\mathbb{O}$ is special. To each two-sided cell $\mathbf{c}$ Lusztig assigned a finite group $\bar{A}$ that is naturally represented as the quotient of the component group A of $\mathbb{O}$.

Further, each two-sided splits into the union of subsets called left cells (and also into the union of subsets called right cells, those are obtained from the left ones by inversion). For dominant regular ϱ the map $w \mapsto J(w\varrho)$ defines a bijection between the set of the left cells in $\mathbf{c}$ and the set of primitive ideals $\mathcal{J}$ with central character ϱ and $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}) = \overline{\mathbb{O}}$ (if ϱ is dominant but not regular one needs to restrict to the left cells that are compatible with ϱ in the sense that any – or equivalently some – element is compatible with ϱ). In [Lu2], to each left cell $c \subset \mathbf{c}$ Lusztig assigned a subgroup $H_c \subset \bar{A}$ defined up to conjugacy. The main result of [LO] is that the A-orbit in $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})$ lying over the primitive ideal $J(w\varrho)$, where $w \in c$ is compatible with dominant ϱ, is $\bar{A}/H_c$.

We will need one more construction related to that result. This construction is a parametrization of elements in $\mathbf{c}$ conjectured by Lusztig and established in [BFO]. In our language it can be stated as follows. Fix a regular dominant weight ϱ. Let Y be the set of all finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules with central character ϱ. By the results of [?], recalled above, the group $\bar{A}$ acts on this set. In particular we can consider the $\bar{A}$-equivariant sheaves of finite dimensional vector spaces on the square $Y \times Y$. Irreducible sheaves are parameterized by triples $(x, y, \mathcal{V})$, where $x, y \in Y$ and $\mathcal{V}$ is an irreducible module over the stabilizer $\bar{A}_{(x,y)}$ of the pair (x, y). These triples are defined up to $\bar{A}$-conjugacy. Here x is lies in the orbit corresponding to $J(w\varrho)$, while y is in the orbit corresponding to $J(w^{-1}\varrho)$.

This identification comes from a certain functor established in [Lo2] that maps the category of Harish-Chandra $\mathcal{U}$-bimodules to a certain category of equivariant bimodules over $\mathcal{W}$. We also remark that in type A this bijection reduces to the RSK correspondence and so it should be thought as a generalization of the RSK correspondence to other Weyl groups.

Another thing about W-algebras we need is that they have categories $\mathcal{O}$ introduced by Brundan, Goodwin and Kleshchev in [BGK] that are analogous to the BGG categories $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{U}$. To define such a category one needs to fix an element $e \in \mathbb{O}$ and, most importantly, an integral semisimple element θ centralizing e. A resulting category will be denoted by $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. The category $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ contains all finite dimensional simple modules with integral central characters (we restrict our our attention on the integral blocks) and also have analogs of Verma modules. One can define the notion of a character, a graded dimension, for a module in that category $\mathcal{O}$. As usual, the characters of Verma modules are computable. So to compute the characters of simple modules (and hence dimensions of the finite dimensional ones) it is enough to determine the multiplicities of simples in Vermas. We would like to point out that in a relatively easy special case when e is a principal element in some Levi subalgebra, the multiplicities are already known, see [Lo3]. Our approach in the present paper builds on a construction from there.

To determine the multiplicities we will define an exact functor from the integral block of an appropriate parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathfrak{g}$ to the integral block of an "equivariant version" of the W-algebra category $\mathcal{O}$. This functor may be thought as a generalization of Soergel's functor $\mathbb{V}$, [So], and so will be called a generalized Soergel functor. An analog of Soergel's functor for parabolic categories $\mathcal{O}$ was studied by Stroppel in [St1],[St2]. In the special case when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A, Brundan and Kleshchev, [BK1], identified the target category for this functor with a subcategory in the category of modules over a W-algebra. We remark that the functor we consider, in general, is not isomorphic to Stroppel's. Our functor will map Verma modules to some variant of Verma modules and will be a quotient functor onto its image. Using this functor we will relate the multiplicities in the W-algebra category $\mathcal{O}$ to those in a parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$. We will also study some other properties of $\mathbb{V}$ such as a relation to dualities and the double centralizer property.

1.3. **Results on Goldie ranks.** Now we are going to state the main results and conjectures of the present paper related to Goldie ranks. We start with a conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1. Let $\mathbb{O}$ be a special nilpotent orbit and suppose that $\mathbb{O}$ is not one of the following three *exceptional* orbits: A_4+A_1 in E_7, $A_4+A_1, E_6(a_1)+A_1$ in E_8 (we use the Bala-Carter notation, see [McG2],[CM]). Then there exists an A-stable 1-dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-module with integral central character. For the three exceptional orbits there is a 1-dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-module with integral central character.

We remark that the primitive ideal corresponding to a 1-dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-module is automatically completely prime, see [Lo1] for the proof or [Lo4] for the explanation how this result follows easily from the previous work of Moeglin, [Mo].

Theorem 1.2. *Conjecture 1.1 holds for all special orbits provided* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is classical.*

Let us state an important corollary of Conjecture 1.1. Let $\mathbf{c}$ be the two-sided cell corresponding to $\mathbb{O}$. Let Y, ϱ, A have the same meaning as in the previous subsection. Pick $w \in \mathbf{c}$ compatible with ϱ. To w assign to it a triple $(x, y, \mathcal{V})$ as explained there (for any regular dominant weight).

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that Conjecture 1.1 holds for the pair* $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbb{O})$. *Then*

(1) *The Goldie rank of* $\mathcal{J}(w\varrho)$ *coincides with the dimension of an irreducible* $\mathcal{W}$*-module in* Y *(all such modules differ by outer automorphisms, so their dimensions are the same).*
(2) $z_w = \dim \mathcal{V}|A_y|/|A_{(x,y)}|$.

Thanks to assertion (2) of Theorem 1.3, Conjecture 1.1 completes one of Joseph's programs of computation of the Goldie ranks (for integral central character), see Subsection 5.1 for details. For classical Lie algebras the group A is commutative, moreover, it is the sum of several copies of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and so $A_{(x,y)} = A_x \cap A_y$, and $\dim \mathcal{V} = 1$. One can recover all numbers appearing on the right hand side in (2) combinatorially starting from w, see [LO, Subsection 4.9]. We also would like to remark that the formula in (2) is compatible with results on z_w obtained in [Jo4].

Let us complete this subsection by describing previous results relating dimensions of irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules to Goldie ranks. The existence of such a relationship was conjectured by Premet in [Pr2, Question 5.1]. In [Lo1], the author proved that the Goldie rank of an arbitrary primitive ideal $\mathcal{J}$ does not exceed the dimension of the corresponding irreducible module. In [Pr3] Premet significantly improved that result by showing that the Goldie rank always divides the dimension. Moreover, he proved that the equality always holds in type A. However, in other classical types the equality does not need to hold (for ideals with non-integral central character). A counter-example is provided by the ideal $\mathcal{J}(\rho/2)$ in type C_n for n large enough, see [Pr3, 1.3], for details. In [Br] Brundan reproved the equality of the Goldie rank and the dimension for type A.

1.4. **Results on characters of simple $\mathcal{W}$-modules.** We will need to fix some notation to state the main result that is an existence of a functor with certain properties.

Fix a nilpotent element $e \in \mathfrak{g}$. We include e into a minimal Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ so that e is a distinguished nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Choose a Cartan and Borel subalgebras $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{b}_0 \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$.

Let $\mathfrak{g}=\bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathfrak{g}(i)$ stand for the eigendecomposition for h. We recall that a distinguished element is always even so $\mathfrak{g}_0(i):=\mathfrak{g}_0\cap\mathfrak{g}(i)$ is zero when i is odd. Form the W-algebra $\mathcal{W}$ from $(\mathfrak{g},e)$.

Pick an integral element $\theta\in\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ such that $\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(\theta)=\mathfrak{g}_0$. Consider the eigen-decomposition $\mathfrak{g}=\bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathfrak{g}_i$. Let $\mathfrak{b}:=\mathfrak{b}_0\oplus\mathfrak{g}_{>0}$, where we set $\mathfrak{g}_{>0}:=\bigoplus_{i>0}\mathfrak{g}_i$, this is a Borel subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$. Further, set $\mathfrak{p}:=\mathfrak{g}_0(\geqslant 0)\oplus\mathfrak{g}_{>0}$. This is a parabolic subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$. Let P denote the corresponding parabolic subgroup.

Let Λ denote the weight lattice for $\mathfrak{g}$. For $\lambda\in\Lambda$ let $L_{00}(\lambda),L_0(\lambda),L(\lambda)$ denote the irreducible modules with highest weight $\lambda-\rho$ for $\mathfrak{g}_0(0),\mathfrak{g}_0$ and $\mathfrak{g}$, respectively. Let $\Lambda_\mathfrak{p}$ denote the subset of all weights λ such that $\langle\lambda,\alpha^\vee\rangle>0$ for all simple roots of $\mathfrak{g}_0(0)$. By $\Lambda_\mathfrak{p}^{max,0}$ we denote the subset of $\Lambda_\mathfrak{p}$ consisting of all λ such that the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of $L_0(\lambda)$ is maximal possible, i.e., equals to $\dim\mathfrak{g}_0-\dim\mathfrak{g}_0(\geqslant 0)$.

We consider two categories: the sum of integral blocks of the parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ for $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p})$, to be denoted by $\mathcal{O}^P$ and the sum of integral blocks of the category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$, denoted by $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$. The definition will be recalled in Subsection 3.2. Let $\mathcal{W}^0$ denote the W-algebra for the pair $(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)$. The simples in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$ are parameterized by finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}^0$-modules with integral central character, the simple corresponding to $\mathcal{N}^0$ will be denoted by $L^\theta_\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{N}^0)$. Further to every finite dimensional $\mathcal{W}^0$-module $\mathcal{N}^0$ with integral central character we can assign a "Verma module" $\Delta^\theta_\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{N}^0)$.

One can compute the character of $\Delta^\theta_\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{N}^0)$. Namely, consider the action of $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ on the centralizer $\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e)$ of e in $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_k$ be all weights (counted with multiplicities) of this action that are negative on θ. Suppose that $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ acts on $\mathcal{N}^0$ with a single weight μ_0. Then the character of $\Delta^\theta_\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ equals $e^{\mu_0}\dim\mathcal{N}^0\prod_{i=1}^k(1-e^{\mu_i})^{-1}$.

We will produce an exact functor $\mathbb{V}:\mathcal{O}^P\to\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$. The character computation for the simples in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$ will be based on the following two properties of $\mathbb{V}$.

1) $\mathbb{V}$ maps the parabolic Verma $\Delta_P(\lambda)$ to $\Delta^\theta_\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{N}^0)$, where $\mathcal{N}^0$ is a $\mathcal{W}^0$-module of dimension equal to $\dim L_{00}(\lambda)$. In particular, the character of $\mathbb{V}(\Delta_P(\lambda))$ equals $e^{\lambda-\rho}\dim L_{00}(\lambda)\prod_{i=1}^k(1-e^{\mu_i})^{-1}$.

2) One can also describe the image of $L(\lambda)$ under $\mathbb{V}$. Namely, if $\lambda\not\in\Lambda_\mathfrak{p}^{max,0}$, then $\mathbb{V}(L(\lambda))=0$. Otherwise, represent λ in the form $w_0\varrho_0$, where w_0 is an element of the Weyl group W_0 of G_0, and ϱ_0 is a weight dominant for $\mathfrak{g}_0$ compatible with w_0. Since $\lambda\in\Lambda_\mathfrak{p}^{max,0}$, the element w_0 lies in the two-sided cell $\mathbf{c}_0$ corresponding to the special orbit G_0e (and, moreover, in a certain fixed right cell corresponding to P). So we can consider the Lusztig quotient $\bar{A}_0$ corresponding to $\mathbf{c}_0$, the subgroup H_0 corresponding to the left cell of w_0 and the H_0-module $\mathcal{V}$ corresponding to w (the $\bar{A}_0$-orbit corresponding to the fixed right cell is trivial). Then $\mathbb{V}$ maps $L(\lambda)$ to $\mathcal{V}\otimes\bigoplus L^\theta_\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{N}^0)$, where the sum is taken over all (in the number equal to $|\bar{A}_0/H_0|$) irreducible $\mathcal{W}^0$-modules $\mathcal{N}^0$ in the orbit corresponding to $w_0\varrho_0$.

It is not difficult to show (see below) that the character of $L^\theta_\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ does not depend on the choice of $\mathcal{N}^0$ in the orbit, denote the corresponding character by $\mathrm{ch}_\mathcal{W}(\varrho_0,\sigma)$, where σ is the left cell of w_0 in W_0. So the multiplicity of $\mathrm{ch}_\mathcal{W}(\varrho_0,\sigma)$ in the character of $\Delta(u\varrho_0)$ for $u\varrho\in\Lambda_\mathfrak{p}$ can be determined by the following formula

$$|\bar{A}_0/H_0|\sum_{w\in\sigma}m(u,w)\dim\mathcal{V}_w, \tag{1.1}$$

where $m(u,w)$ is the multiplicity of $L(w_0\varrho_0)$ in $\Delta_P(u\varrho_0)$. This multiplicity is known and is given by (the value at 1 of) the appropriate parabolic Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial. We remark that we can have $\dim \mathcal{V}_w > 1$ only if $\bar{A}_0 = S_3, S_4, S_5$ that can only happen in exceptional types. In general, it is unclear how to determine $\mathcal{V}_w$ from w.

Once the multiplicities of all $\mathrm{ch}_{\mathcal{W}}(\varrho_0, \sigma)$ in the character of all $\Delta(u\varrho_0)$ are known, we can determine the former characters.

To finish this discussion we would like to point out that the functor $\mathbb{V}$ has other nice properties to be investigated in the present paper.

Let us mention some special cases where the character formulas where known before. In type A, they follow from the work of Brundan and Kleschev, [BK1]. Somewhat more generally, if e is principal in a Levi subalgebra, then the character formulas follow from the results of [Lo3]. We remark that both computations are essentially based on using essentially opposite special cases of the functor $\mathbb{V}$. Let us also mention that for minimal nilpotent elements the character formulas follow from results of [Pr2].

Another result related to ours is the main result of [BM]. There they deal with simple non-restricted representations over semisimple Lie algebras (or, which is basically the same, over W-algebras) in characteristic p. Their main result is that the classes of simples form a canonical basis in the sense of Kashiwara. However this does not allow to compute these classes explicitly (with a possible exception of the case when e is principal in a Levi).

For p large enough, one can take an irreducible finite dimensional representation of $\mathcal{W}$, reduce this representation (or rather its integral form; see, for example, [Pr3] for technical details on this procedure) modulo p and get an irreducible finite dimensional representation for the W-algebra in characteristic p. However, a relatively small portion of simples in characteristic p is obtained in this way. So, comparing to [BM], we get more explicit formulas but for smaller number of modules.

We get two ways to compute the Goldie ranks of primitive ideals: one via a more explicit formula coming from the character formulas in the W-algebra category $\mathcal{O}$ and one implementing a program of Joseph. It is completely unclear to the author why these formulas give the same result!

1.5. **Organization and content of the paper.** The paper is divided into sections that are divided into subsections. Theorems, propositions, remarks, equations etc. are numbered within a subsection. Several subsections are further divided into parts. Some of the common notation and assumptions used in the paper are gathered in the next subsection.

Let us describe the content of this paper, section by section.

Section 2 is preliminary and does not contain new results. There we explain (a slight ramification) of the definition of a W-algebra via a quantum slice construction that first appeared in [Lo1] somewhat implicitly and in [Lo5] in a more refined form. Next, in Subsection 2.2, we recall the main construction of [Lo2]: a functor $\bullet_\dagger$ between the categories of Harish-Chandra bimodules for $\mathcal{U}$ and for $\mathcal{W}$. There are several reasons why we need this functor, for example, the functor $\mathbb{V}$ mentioned above can be defined analogously to $\bullet_\dagger$. Also $\bullet_\dagger$ plays an important role both in the study of $\mathbb{V}$ and in the computation of Goldie ranks. In Subsection 2.3 we recall the classification of finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules obtained in [LO]. Subsection 2.4 describes the images of certain simple Harish-Chandra $\mathcal{U}$-bimodules. This gives rise to the generalized RSK correspondence mentioned above and again plays an important role in the computation of characters and a crucial role in the computation of Goldie ranks. Subsection 2.5 briefly recalls some results on a parabolic induction for W-algebras obtained in [Lo4]. We will need this results to prove Conjecture 1.1 for classical groups. Finally, large

Subsection 2.6 deals with various isomorphisms, mostly of certain completions, that can be deduced from the quantum slice construction.

In Section 3 we introduce categories of modules that are involved in our construction and study of $\mathbb{V}$. In the first subsection we recall some known facts about parabolic categories $\mathcal{O}$ including the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence. The latter is a crucial tool to transfer the properties of $\bullet_\dagger$ to those of $\mathbb{V}$. In Subsection 3.2 we recall the definition of a category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$ basically following [BGK]. We also recall the construction of Verma modules and explain how to compute their characters again following [BGK]. Next, we introduce the category of Whittaker $\mathcal{U}$-modules basically as it appeared in [Lo3] and recall an equivalence between W-algebra categories $\mathcal{O}$ and the Whittaker categories. In the final part of Subsection 3.2 we introduce a duality functor for a W-algebra category $\mathcal{O}$, the construction is pretty standard. Subsection 3.3 is new but is not very original. There we study the completed versions of W-algebra categories $\mathcal{O}$ and of Whittaker categories. A completed version of a W-algebra category $\mathcal{O}$ is obtained from the usual one via completion. This is no longer so for Whittaker categories, a completed version is different from the usual one. Yet, we show that it still has analogs of Verma modules and is equivalent to a complete category $\mathcal{O}$ for the W-algebra.

Section 4 is one of the two central sections of this paper. There we introduce a functor $\mathbb{V}$ and study its properties. In Subsection 4.1 we define a functor denoted by $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ that generalizes $\bullet_\dagger$. Its source category is an appropriate category of $\mathcal{U}$-modules and the target category is a category of $\mathcal{W}$-modules. After the functor is constructed we study some its general properties: we show that it is exact, intertwines tensor products with Harish-Chandra bimodules and study the question of existence of a right adjoint functor. In Subsection 4.2 we construct a functor $\mathbb{V} : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu \to \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_\nu$ (the notation will be explained below). We provide three constructions and show that they are equivalent. The first construction is as $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$, while the other two constructions use the equivalences between the two versions (usual and completed) of the Whittaker category and the two versions of the category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$. Further, under some restrictions on P we show that $\mathbb{V}$ is 0-faithful, i.e. fully faithful on modules admitting a parabolic Verma filtration. The last Subsection 4.3 establishes some further properties of $\mathbb{V}$. Most importantly, there we show that $\mathbb{V}$ is a quotient functor onto its image and has the double centralizer property. The properties of $\mathbb{V}$ including those needed for character formulas are summarized in Theorem 4.6. In process of proving that the three constructions are equivalent we establish some important properties of $\mathbb{V}$, for example, its behavior on parabolic Verma modules and a relation with the duality functors.

In Section 5 we deal with Goldie ranks. First, we recall some known results on them, almost entirely due to Joseph. In Subsection 5.2 we use the results quoted in Subsections 2.2,2.4 to prove some formula for the scale factors z_w. In Subsection 5.3 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.3 modulo Conjecture 1.1. Finally, in Subsection 5.4 we prove Conjecture 1.1 for the classical types. For this we first use a reduction procedure based on the parabolic induction for W-algebras. Then we deal with the three classical types (we do not consider type A) one by one, explaining type B in detail and then describing modifications to be made for types C and D.

Section 6 deals with three topics that are related to the functor $\mathbb{V}$. In Subsection 6.1 we discuss the functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ for Harish-Chandra $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-modules. This subsection does not contain any results because at the moment we do not have them. In Subsection 6.2 we study a different version of the functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ for a parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$, one associated with the Richardson orbit. This functor was studied by Stroppel in [St1],[St2] but she did not relate the target category to W-algebras. We show that many properties of the functor $\mathbb{V}$

carry over to this situation. We also analyze conditions that guarantee the 0-faithfulness of our functor in type A. In the last subsection of Section 6 we extended (in a straightforward way) the definition of $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ to the categories of modules over Dixmier algebras (i.e., algebras equipped with a homomorphism from $\mathcal{U}$ turning them into Harish Chandra bimodules). We are basically interested in two classes of Dixmier algebras: one coming from Lie superalgebras and the other from quantum groups in root of unity: we show that the quantum Frobenius epimorphism splits turning (in fact, some mild quotient of) the Lusztig form of a quantum group into a Dixmier algebra.

1.6. **Notation and conventions.** In this subsection we will list some notation and conventions used in this paper. They will be duplicated (and explained in more detail) below.

Our base field is an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic 0.

1.6.1. *Algebras and groups.* Let G be a reductive algebraic group over $\mathbb{K}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ be its Lie algebra. Fix a nilpotent element e and include it into an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e,h,f). Let $\mathbb{O}$ denote the G-orbit of e. Fix a non-degenerate symmetric G-invariant form on $\mathfrak{g}$, say $(\cdot,\cdot)$, whose restriction to the rational form of a Cartan subalgebra is positive definite. Using this form we can identify $\mathfrak{g}$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*$. We write χ for the image of e under this identification. By Q we denote the centralizer of (e,h,f) in G. This is a reductive subgroup of G. We write $\mathfrak{g}(i)$ for the eigenspace of $\operatorname{ad} h := [h,\cdot]$ with eigenvalue i and use the notation like $\mathfrak{g}(>0)$ for $\bigoplus_{i>0}\mathfrak{g}(i)$.

By $\mathcal{U}$ or $U(\mathfrak{g})$ we denote the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We consider the Slodowy slice $S = e + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(f) \subset \mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g}^*$, where $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\bullet)$ stands for the centralizer in $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathcal{W}$ denote the W-algebra of the pair $(\mathfrak{g},e)$. Sometimes when we want to explicitly indicate the Lie algebra and the nilpotent element used to produce a W-algebra, we use the notation like $U(\mathfrak{g},e)$ for the W-algebra.

Set $V := [\mathfrak{g}, f]$. By $\mathbb{A}$ we denote the Weyl algebra of V.

We also will consider the "homogenizations" of the algebras above, they will be decorated with the subscript "$\hbar$".

In Subsection 2.6, Sections 3 and Subsections 4.2,4.3 we will use the following notation. We will fix an integral element $\theta \in \mathfrak{g}$ centralizing e,h,f such that the element e in $\mathfrak{g}_0 := \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\theta)$. By G_0 we denote the connected subgroup of G corresponding to $\mathfrak{g}_0$. We will consider the gradings by eigenspaces of $\operatorname{ad}\theta$: $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathfrak{g}_i, V = \bigoplus_i V_i, \mathcal{U} = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{W} = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{W}_i$. We use the notation like $\mathcal{U}_{\geqslant 0}$ similarly to the above. Further, we consider the algebras $\mathcal{U}^0 := \mathcal{U}_{\geqslant 0}/(\mathcal{U}_{\geqslant 0}\cap \mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}_{>0}), \mathcal{W}^0, \mathbb{A}^0$ (to see that these spaces are actually algebras we notice that, for example, $\mathcal{U}_{\geqslant 0}$ is a subalgebra in $\mathcal{U}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{\geqslant 0}\cap\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}_{>0}$ is a two-sided ideal in $\mathcal{U}_{\geqslant 0}$).

We write $\mathfrak{m}$ for $\mathfrak{g}_0(<0)\oplus\mathfrak{g}_{>0}$, $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ for $\mathfrak{g}_0(<0)\oplus\mathfrak{g}_{<0}$, $\mathfrak{p}$ for $\mathfrak{g}_0(\geqslant 0)\oplus\mathfrak{g}_{>0}$, and $\mathfrak{t}$ for $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$. Let $M,\bar{M},P,T$ be the corresponding connected subgroups of G so that $M,\bar{M}$ are unipotent, P is parabolic, T is a torus. Further we choose a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}\subset\mathfrak{g}_0$ and a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}\subset\mathfrak{g}$ such that $\mathfrak{b}_0 := \mathfrak{b}\cap\mathfrak{g}_0$ is a Borel subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Let $\Lambda\subset\mathfrak{h}^*$ denote the weight lattice and Λ^+ be the subset of dominant weights. As usual, we write ρ for half the sum of positive roots.

We write $\mathfrak{m}^0 := \mathfrak{m}\cap\mathfrak{g}_0, \bar{\mathfrak{m}}^0 := \bar{\mathfrak{m}}\cap\mathfrak{g}_0$. We consider the shift $\mathfrak{m}_\chi := \{x - \langle\chi,x\rangle, x\in\mathfrak{m}\}\subset \mathfrak{g}\oplus\mathbb{K}$ and the similar shifts $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_\chi, \mathfrak{m}^0_\chi, \bar{\mathfrak{m}}^0_\chi$. Further, we set $\mathfrak{v} := \mathfrak{m}\cap V, \bar{\mathfrak{v}} := \bar{\mathfrak{m}}\cap V$.

We consider the completions $\mathcal{U}^\wedge := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{U}\mathfrak{m}_\chi^n$, ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{U}/\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_\chi^n\mathcal{U}$, $\mathbb{A}^\wedge := \varprojlim_n \mathbb{A}/\mathbb{A}\mathfrak{v}^n$, ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A} := \varprojlim_n \mathbb{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^n\mathbb{A}$, $\mathcal{W}^\wedge := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}\mathcal{W}_{>0}^n$, ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W} := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_{<0}^n\mathcal{W}$ and the similar completions of $\mathcal{U}^0, \mathcal{W}^0, \mathbb{A}^0$.

Finally, in this context, for R we take the centralizer of $T \subset Q$ in Q. This is a reductive subgroup.

1.6.2. *Categories and functors.* Here we are going to explain some notation used mostly in Sections 3,4.

We usually abbreviate "Harish-Chandra" as "HC". We use the notation $\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})$ for the category of HC $\mathcal{U}$-bimodules, and $\mathrm{HC}^Q(\mathcal{W})$ for the category of Q-equivariant HC $\mathcal{W}$-bimodules.

For an algebraic subgroup $K \subset G$ and a character ν of its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ we write $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^K_\nu$ for the category of (K,ν)-equivariant modules. We say that a $(\mathcal{U},K)$-module $\mathcal{M}$ is (K,ν)-equivariant if the structure map $\mathcal{U}\otimes\mathcal{M}\to\mathcal{M}$ is K-equivariant and the differential of the K-action coincides with the $\mathfrak{k}$-action given by $(x,m)\mapsto xm-\nu(x)m$. We write $\mathcal{O}^K_\mu$ for the full subcategory in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^K_\nu$ consisting of finitely generated modules. When $\nu=0$, we suppress the subscript.

In particular, we are going to consider the parabolic categories $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ for $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p})$ and $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$ for $(\mathfrak{g}_0,\mathfrak{p}_0)$. The parabolic Verma modules with highest weights $\lambda-\rho$ are denoted by $\Delta_P(\lambda),\Delta_{P_0}(\lambda)$. Their simple quotients are denoted by $L(\lambda),L_0(\lambda)$. We write $L_{00}(\lambda)$ for the irreducible $\mathfrak{g}_0(0)$-module with highest weight $\lambda-\rho$. The Verma modules in the whole BGG category $\mathcal{O}$ are denoted by $\Delta(\lambda)$.

The categories $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$ constructed from the element θ are denoted by $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ (the usual version), $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$ (the R-equivariant version), $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ (the completed version). For the Whittaker categories we use the notation like $\mathrm{Wh}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ etc. Again, when ν is integral, we suppress it from the notation.

There are various functors between the categories under consideration. We write $\widehat{\bullet}$ for the weight completion functor, it maps a module of the form $\bigoplus_\mu \mathcal{M}_\mu$, where $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is the $\mathfrak{t}$-weight space with weight μ, to $\prod_\mu \mathcal{M}_\mu$. For example, we will have the completion functor $\widehat{\bullet}:\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu\to\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$.

We also consider a different type of completions to be denoted by $\bullet^\wedge$. These are $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_\chi$-adic completions: $\mathcal{M}^\wedge := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{M}/\bar{\mathfrak{m}}^n_\chi\mathcal{M}$, this gives a functor, for instance, from $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ to $\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$. Somewhat dually, we have a functor Wh_ν that takes a $\mathcal{U}$-module and maps it to the sum of all submodules that are objects in $\mathrm{Wh}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$.

On some categories of interest, we have a "naive" duality functor to be denoted by $\bullet^\vee$. This functor is the composition of taking the restricted dual, to be denoted by $\mathcal{M}\mapsto\mathcal{M}^{(*)}$, and the twist by an anti-automorphism, say τ, $\mathcal{M}^{(*)}\mapsto {}^\tau\mathcal{M}^{(*)}$. We will also consider the homological duality functor that comes from RHom. This functor is denoted by $\mathcal{D}$.

Next, we have "Verma module" functors: $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}:\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)_\nu\to\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu, \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)^R_\nu\to\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$, $\Delta^0:\mathcal{U}^0\text{-mod}\to\mathcal{U}\text{-mod}, \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}:\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)_\nu\to\mathrm{Wh}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu, \hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}:\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)\to\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$, etc. We will consider the quotients $L^?_?(\bullet)$ by the maximal submodule that does not intersect the highest weight subspace.

1.6.3. *Cells, primitive ideals etc.* This notation is mostly used in Section 5. We write W (resp., W_0) for the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$ (resp., $\mathfrak{g}_0$) acting to the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$.

We usually denote a two-sided cell by $\mathbf{c}$ and left cells by c, c_1, etc.. We write $\mathbb{O}_{\mathbf{c}}$ for the special orbit corresponding to $\mathbf{c}$. Let $\bar{A}$ denote the Lusztig quotient of the component group $A(\mathbb{O}_{\mathbf{c}})$ (i.e., the component group of the centralizer of some element of $\mathbb{O}_{\mathbf{c}}$ in the adjoint group). By H_c we denote the Lusztig subgroup of $\bar{A}$ corresponding to c. The corresponding object for $\mathfrak{g}_0$ are decorated with the subscript "0".

To an element w we can assign a simple HC bimodule $\mathcal{M}_w$ of $\mathfrak{g}$-finite maps $\Delta(\rho)\rightarrow L(w\rho)$. We write $J(\lambda)$ for the annihilator of $L(\lambda)$ in $\mathcal{U}$. For a HC bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ we write $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{M})$ for its associated variety that is a subvariety in $\mathfrak{g}\cong\mathfrak{g}^*$.

By $\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ we denote the annihilator of $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ in $\mathcal{U}$. Here ν is a character of $\mathfrak{p}$.

There will be some other notation related to Goldie ranks introduced in Section 5.

1.6.4. *Miscellaneous notation.* Below we present some other notation to be used in the paper.

$\mathcal{A}^{opp}$	the opposite algebra of $\mathcal{A}$.
$\widehat{\otimes}$	the completed tensor product of complete topological vector spaces/ modules.
$(a_1,\ldots,a_k)$	the two-sided ideal in an associative algebra generated by elements $a_1,\ldots,a_k$.
$A^\wedge_\chi$	the completion of a commutative (or "almost commutative") algebra A with respect to the maximal ideal of a point $\chi\in\operatorname{Spec}(A)$.
$\operatorname{Ann}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{M})$	the annihilator of an $\mathcal{A}$-module $\mathcal{M}$ in an algebra $\mathcal{A}$.
$D(X)$	the algebra of differential operators on a smooth variety X.
G°	the connected component of unit in an algebraic group G.
(G,G)	the derived subgroup of a group G.
G_x	the stabilizer of x in G.
$\operatorname{Grk}(\mathcal{A})$	the Goldie rank of a prime Noetherian algebra $\mathcal{A}$.
$\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{A}$	the associated graded vector space of a filtered vector space $\mathcal{A}$.
$R_\hbar(\mathcal{A})$	$:=\bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\hbar^i\,\mathrm{F}_i\,\mathcal{A}$:the Rees $\mathbb{K}[\hbar]$-module of a filtered vector space $\mathcal{A}$.
$S(V)$	the symmetric algebra of a vector space V.
$\mathfrak{X}(H)$	the group of characters of an algebraic group H.

1.7. **Acknowledgements.** I would like to thank J. Adams, R. Bezrukavnikov, J. Brundan, I. Gordon, A. Joseph, G. Lusztig, V. Ostrik, A. Premet, C. Stroppel, D. Vogan and W. Wang for stimulating discussions related to various parts of this paper.

2. W-algebras and finite dimensional modules

2.1. **W-algebras via a slice construction.** Let $G,\mathfrak{g},e,h,f,(\cdot,\cdot),\chi,\mathcal{U},Q,\mathbb{O}$ have the same meaning as in Subsection 1.6. Further, let τ be either an involutive anti-automorphism of G with $\tau(e)=e,\tau(f)=f,\tau(h)=-h$ or (for formal technical reasons) the identity. We will mostly use τ described in 2.6.1.

Let us recall the construction of a W-algebra associated to the pair $(\mathfrak{g},e)$ (or, more precisely, to $\mathfrak{g}$ and the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple e,h,f). Consider the group $\widehat{Q}:=\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}\ltimes(Q\times\mathbb{K}^\times)$, where the generator ς of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ corresponds to τ. The action of ς on Q is induced by τ, while the action on $\mathbb{K}^\times$ is trivial. The group $\widehat{Q}$ acts on $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}^*$: for $q\in Q,t\in\mathbb{K}^\times,x\in\mathfrak{g},\alpha\in\mathfrak{g}^*$ we set: $q.x=\mathrm{Ad}(q)x, q.\alpha=\mathrm{Ad}^*(q)\alpha, t.x=t^2\exp(\ln(t)\operatorname{ad}(h))x, t.\alpha=t^{-2}\exp(\ln(t)\operatorname{ad}^*(h))\alpha, \varsigma.x=\tau(x),\varsigma.\alpha=\tau(\alpha)$. We remark that this action fixes χ. Also the *Slodowy slice* $S:=e+\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(f)\subset\mathfrak{g}$ is $\widehat{Q}$-stable.

Consider the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. We endow this algebra with a "doubled" PBW filtration $\mathrm{F}_0\mathcal{U}=\mathbb{K}\subset\mathrm{F}_1\mathcal{U}\subset\ldots\subset\mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathrm{F}_i\mathcal{U}$ is the span of all monomials of degree $\leqslant i/2$. Let $\mathcal{U}_\hbar$ stand for the Rees algebra with respect to this filtration, $\mathcal{U}_\hbar:=\bigoplus_{i=0}^{+\infty}\mathrm{F}_i\mathcal{U}\cdot\hbar^i$. On $\mathcal{U}_\hbar$ we have an action of the group $\widetilde{Q}:=\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}\times\widehat{Q}$ given as follows: the action of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is trivial and the action of $\widehat{Q}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is as before, while $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}\ltimes Q$

acts trivially on $\hbar$, the other copy of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ acts on $\hbar$ by changing the sign, and $t.\hbar = t\hbar$ for $t \in \mathbb{K}^\times$. We can view χ as a homomorphism $\mathcal{U}_\hbar \to \mathbb{K}$ via $\mathcal{U}_\hbar \xrightarrow{/\hbar} S(\mathfrak{g}) \xrightarrow{\chi} \mathbb{K}$. Let $I_\chi, \tilde{I}_\chi$ denote the kernels of χ in $S(\mathfrak{g}), \mathcal{U}_\hbar$, respectively. It is easy to see that I_χ is $\widetilde{Q}$-stable and therefore $\widetilde{Q}$ acts on the completion $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ with respect to χ.

Set $V := [\mathfrak{g}, f]$. We can view V as a subspace in $T^*_\chi\mathfrak{g}^* = I_\chi/I_\chi^2$ via the map $V \to I_\chi$ sending v to $v - \langle\chi, v\rangle$.

We claim that there is an embedding $\iota : V \to \tilde{I}_\chi^{\wedge_\chi}$ with the following properties:

1. ι is $\widetilde{Q}$-equivariant.
2. The composition of ι with a natural projection $\tilde{I}_\chi^{\wedge_\chi} \twoheadrightarrow I_\chi/I_\chi^2$ is the natural inclusion $V \subset I_\chi/I_\chi^2$.
3. $[\iota(u), \iota(v)] = \hbar^2\omega(u, v)$ for all $u, v \in V$, where ω denotes the Kostant-Kirillov form on V.

See [Lo5] for the proof (where we had a smaller reductive group). So ι extends to a homomorphism (actually an embedding) of the homogenized Weyl algebra $\mathbb{A}_\hbar(V)^{\wedge_0} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$, where $\mathbb{A}_\hbar(V)$, by definition, is $T(V)[\hbar]/(u \otimes v - v \otimes u - \hbar^2\omega(u, v))$ and the superscript $\wedge_0$ means the completion at 0. Then, as we have seen in [Lo2], the algebra $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ decomposes into the tensor product $\mathbb{A}_\hbar(V)^{\wedge_0}\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{W}'_\hbar$, where $\mathcal{W}'_\hbar$ stands for the centralizer of $\iota(V)$ in $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$. We remark that $\mathcal{W}'_\hbar/(\hbar)$ is naturally identified with $\mathbb{K}[S]^{\wedge_\chi}$. The subalgebra $\mathcal{W}_\hbar$ of all $\mathbb{K}^\times$-finite elements in $\mathcal{W}'_\hbar$, i.e., the elements that lie in a finite dimensional $\mathbb{K}^\times$-stable subspace, is dense in $\mathcal{W}'_\hbar$ and $\mathcal{W}_\hbar/(\hbar) = \mathbb{K}[S]$. By definition, $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{W}_\hbar/(\hbar - 1)$. This is a filtered algebra that comes with a $Q \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-action by automorphisms and an anti-automorphism τ, both preserve the filtration. Moreover, the construction easily implies that there is a Q- and τ-equivariant Lie algebra homomorphism (a quantum comoment map) $\mathfrak{q} \to \mathcal{W}$ with image in $\mathrm{F}_{\leqslant 2}\mathcal{W}$ such that the adjoint $\mathfrak{q}$-action on $\mathcal{W}$ coincides with the differential of the G-action. In more detail, we can consider the natural inclusion $\mathfrak{q} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$, denote it by $\varphi_{\mathcal{U}}$. Also we have a natural inclusion of $\mathfrak{sp}(V) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_\hbar^{\wedge_0}$ (as a complement of $\mathbb{K}\hbar$ in the degree 2 component of $\mathbb{A}_\hbar$). Composing this with the Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathfrak{q} \to \mathfrak{sp}(V)$, we get a map $\varphi_{\mathbb{A}} : \mathfrak{q} \to \mathbb{A}_\hbar^{\wedge_0}$. As we have seen in [Lo5], under the identification $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi} \cong \mathbb{A}_\hbar^{\wedge_0}\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{W}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$, the map $\varphi_{\mathcal{U}}$ decomposes into the sum $\varphi_{\mathbb{A}} + \varphi_{\mathcal{W}}$, with $\varphi_{\mathcal{W}}$ being a Q-equivariant map $\mathfrak{q} \to \mathcal{W}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ with image lying in degree 2 component, and, in particular, in $\mathcal{W}_\hbar$. The Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathfrak{q} \to \mathcal{W}$ is obtained from $\varphi_{\mathcal{W}}$ by taking the quotient by $\hbar - 1$.

All choices we have made differ by an automorphism of the form $\exp(\frac{1}{\hbar^2}\operatorname{ad} f)$, where $f \in \tilde{I}_\chi^3$ and $\frac{1}{\hbar^2}f$ is $\widetilde{Q}$-invariant. So as a filtered algebra with a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \ltimes Q)$-action and with a quantum comoment map $\mathfrak{q} \to \mathcal{W}$, $\mathcal{W}$ is independent of the choice of ι up to an isomorphism.

An important property of $\mathcal{W}$ is that its center is naturally identified with the center $\mathcal{Z}$ of $\mathcal{U}$. This was first proved by Ginzburg and Premet, see Subsection 2.2 of [Lo2] for details.

In fact, below we will need a more specific choice of ι.

2.2. **Functor $\bullet_\dagger$.** This is a functor from the category of Harish-Chandra $\mathcal{U}$-bimodules to the category of Harish-Chandra $\mathcal{W}$-bimodules introduced in [Lo2] (a closely related functor was constructed by Ginzburg in [Gi]). Let us recall the definitions of the categories, first.

By a Harish-Chandra bimodule over $\mathcal{U}$ (relative to G) we mean a finitely generated $\mathcal{U}$-bimodule M such that the adjoint action of $\mathfrak{g}$, $\operatorname{ad}(x)m = xm - mx$, is locally finite and integrates to a G-action (the last condition is vacuous when the group is semisimple and simply connected). On such a bimodule one can introduce a *good filtration*, i.e., a G-stable filtration $\mathrm{F}_i\,\mathcal{M}$ that is compatible with the algebra filtration $\mathrm{F}_i\,\mathcal{U}$ and such that the associated graded $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$ is a finitely generated $S(\mathfrak{g})$-module. Using this we can define the associated variety $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{M})$ of $\mathcal{M}$ as the support of $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$, this is a conical G-stable subvariety in $\mathfrak{g}\cong\mathfrak{g}^*$ independent of the choice of a good filtration. The category of Harish-Chandra (HC, for short) bimodules will be denoted by $\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})$.

By a Q-equivariant Harish-Chandra $\mathcal{W}$-bimodule we mean a $\mathcal{W}$-bimodule $\mathcal{N}$ equipped with a Q-action compatible with the Q-action on $\mathcal{W}$ (in the sense that the structure map $\mathcal{W}\otimes\mathcal{N}\otimes\mathcal{W}\to\mathcal{N}$ is Q-equivariant) and subject to the following conditions:

- there is a Q-stable filtration $\mathrm{F}_i\,\mathcal{N}$ on $\mathcal{N}$ that is compatible with the algebra filtration on $\mathcal{W}$,
- we have $[\mathrm{F}_i\,\mathcal{W},\mathrm{F}_j\,\mathcal{N}]\subset\mathrm{F}_{i+j-2}\,\mathcal{N}$ for all i and j,
- $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{N}$ is a finitely generated $\mathbb{K}[S]$-module,
- and the differential of the Q-action on $\mathcal{N}$ coincides with the the adjoint $\mathfrak{q}$-action.

The category of Q-equivariant HC $\mathcal{W}$-bimodules will be denoted by $\mathrm{HC}^Q(\mathcal{W})$.

A functor $\bullet_\dagger:\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})\to\mathrm{HC}^Q(\mathcal{W})$ is constructed using the same construction as was used to construct $\mathcal{W}$ in the previous subsection. Namely, take $\mathcal{M}\in\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})$. Form the Rees bimodule $\mathcal{M}_\hbar$ with respect to some good filtration. We can complete $\mathcal{M}_\hbar$ with respect to the (left or right, does not matter) $\tilde{I}_\chi$-adic topology. Denote the resulting $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$-bimodule by $\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$. This bimodule carries a $Q\times\mathbb{K}^\times$-action compatible with a $Q\times\mathbb{K}^\times$-action on $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$. Then one can show that $\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ splits into the completed tensor product $\mathbb{A}_\hbar(V)^{\wedge_0}\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{N}'_\hbar$, where $\mathcal{N}'_\hbar$ is the centralizer of V in $\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ and hence is a $\mathcal{W}'_\hbar$-module. Then again the $\mathbb{K}^\times$-finite part $\mathcal{N}_\hbar$ of $\mathcal{N}'_\hbar$ is dense. We set $\mathcal{M}_\dagger:=\mathcal{N}_\hbar/(\hbar-1)\mathcal{N}_\hbar$. This can be shown to be canonically independent of the choice of a good filtration on $\mathcal{M}$. So $\bullet_\dagger$ is a functor.

The functor $\bullet_\dagger:\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})\to\mathrm{HC}^Q(\mathcal{W})$ has the following properties, see [Lo2]:

(i) $\bullet_\dagger$ is exact.
(ii) With the choice of filtration as above, the sheaf $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}_\dagger$ on S is the restriction of the sheaf $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$ (on $\mathfrak{g}^*=\mathfrak{g}$) to S.
(iii) In particular, consider the full subcategories $\mathrm{HC}_{\partial\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})\subset\mathrm{HC}_{\overline{\mathbb{O}}}(\mathcal{U})\subset\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})$ consisting of all HC bimodules whose associated varieties are contained in the boundary $\partial\mathbb{O}$ and the closure $\overline{\mathbb{O}}$ of $\mathbb{O}$. Then $\bullet_\dagger$ annihilates $\mathrm{HC}_{\partial\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})$ and sends $\mathrm{HC}_{\overline{\mathbb{O}}}(\mathcal{U})$ to finite dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-bimodules.
(iv) For $\mathcal{M}\in\mathrm{HC}_{\overline{\mathbb{O}}}(\mathcal{U})$, the dimension of $\mathcal{M}_\dagger$ coincides with the multiplicity $\operatorname{mult}_{\mathbb{O}}\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathbb{O}$ (=generic rank of $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathbb{O}$).
(v) There is a right adjoint functor $\bullet^\dagger:\mathrm{HC}^Q_{fin}(\mathcal{W})\to\mathrm{HC}_{\overline{\mathbb{O}}}(\mathcal{U})$. Moreover, its composition with the quotient $\mathrm{HC}_{\overline{\mathbb{O}}}(\mathcal{U})\twoheadrightarrow\mathrm{HC}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})$ is left inverse to $\bullet_\dagger$. In other words, $\bullet_\dagger:\mathrm{HC}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})\to\mathrm{HC}^Q_{fin}(\mathcal{W})$ is an equivalence onto its image.
(vi) Let $\mathcal{M}\in\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be a Q-stable subbimodule of finite codimension in $\mathcal{M}_\dagger$. Then there is a unique maximal subbimodule $\mathcal{M}'\subset\mathcal{M}$ with the property $\mathcal{M}'_\dagger=\mathcal{N}$. We automatically have $\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}'\in\mathrm{HC}_{\overline{\mathbb{O}}}(\mathcal{U})$.

2.3. **Classification of finite dimensional irreducible modules.** We are going to recall the classification of finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules with integral central characters (this notion makes sense because the centers of $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ are identified). This classification was done in [LO].

We start by recalling one of the main results from [Lo2]. By the construction of $\mathcal{W}$, the group Q acts on $\mathcal{W}$ by algebra automorphisms. This gives rise to a Q-action on the set $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})$ of isomorphism classes of finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules. Clearly, $Z(G)$ acts trivially. Also recall that there is a Q-equivariant Lie algebra embedding of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{q}$ of Q into $\mathcal{W}$ such that the differential of the Q-action coincides with the adjoint $\mathfrak{q}$-action. Therefore Q° acts trivially and so we get an action of the component group $A := Q/Q^\circ Z(G)$ on $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})$. The orbit space $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})/A$ gets naturally identified with the set $\operatorname{Pr}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})$ of primitive ideals $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{U}$ with $\operatorname{V}(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}) = \overline{\mathbb{O}}$. Namely, to an A-orbit we, first, assign the intersection of the annihilators of the corresponding irreducibles in $\mathcal{W}$. This intersection is a Q-stable ideal, say $\mathcal{I}$, of finite codimension. Then we can apply property (vi) to $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{U}$ (so that $\mathcal{M}_\dagger = \mathcal{W}$), and $\mathcal{N} := \mathcal{I}$. The corresponding ideal $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{U}$ can be seen to be primitive, and this is the ideal we need. This identification is compatible with that of the centers.

Now let us recall a result from [LO] that explains how to compute the A-orbit lying over a primitive ideal $\mathcal{J}$ in the case when $\mathcal{J}$ has integral central character. The existence of such $\mathcal{J}$ implies that $\mathbb{O}$ is special in the sense of Lusztig. So to $\mathbb{O}$ we can assign a two-sided cell, say $\mathbf{c}$, that is a subset of W. To $\mathbf{c}$ one assigns a subset $\operatorname{Irr}^{\mathbf{c}}(W)$ (called a *family*) in the set $\operatorname{Irr}(W)$ of irreducible representations of W, where, recall, W denotes the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let Y^Λ denote the subset of $\operatorname{Irr}_{fin}(\mathcal{W})$ consisting of all modules with integral central character. The A-action on Y^Λ factors through a certain quotient $\bar{A}$ of A introduced by Lusztig in [Lu1]. To define this quotient consider the Springer $W \times A$-module $\operatorname{Spr}(\mathbb{O})$. Consider its W-submodule $\operatorname{Spr}(\mathbb{O})^{\mathbf{c}}$ that is the sum of all irreducible W-submodules belonging to $\mathbf{c}$. Of course, this is also an A-submodule. The group $\bar{A}$ is the quotient of A by the kernel of the A-action on $\operatorname{Spr}(\mathbb{O})^{\mathbf{c}}$.

Now let us describe the stabilizers. Pick a left cell $c \subset \mathbf{c}$ and let λ be a dominant weight compatible with c (i.e., compatible with any $w \in c$, this condition is independent of the choice of w). We can view λ as a point in $\mathfrak{h}/W$ and hence as a central character for $\mathcal{U}$. The set of the left cells in $\mathbf{c}$ compatible with λ is in a bijection with the set of the primitive ideals $\mathcal{J}$ with central character λ and $\operatorname{V}(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}) = \overline{\mathbb{O}}$: to c we assign the ideal $J(w\lambda)$, the annihilator of the irreducible highest weight module $L(w\lambda)$ with highest weight $w\lambda - \rho$, where $w \in c$.

According to Theorem 1.1 from [LO], the stabilizer of the orbit over $J(w\lambda), w \in c$, is the subgroup $H_c \subset \bar{A}$ defined by Lusztig in [Lu2]. It can be described as follows. Consider the cell module $[c]$. Then $\operatorname{Hom}_W([c], \operatorname{Spr}(\mathbb{O})) = \operatorname{Hom}_W([c], \operatorname{Spr}(\mathbb{O})^{\mathbf{c}})$ is an $\bar{A}$-module. It turns out that there is a unique (up to conjugacy) subgroup $H_c \subset \bar{A}$ such that the $\bar{A}$-modules $\mathbb{Q}(\bar{A}/H_c)$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_W([c], \operatorname{Spr}(\mathbb{O}))$ are isomorphic. See [LO], Section 6, for an explicit computations of H_c starting from $[c]$.

2.4. **Semisimple HC bimodules.** Now fix a finite set Λ' of dominant weights such that the pairwise differences of the elements of Λ' lie in the root lattice and such that there is a regular element $\varrho \in \Lambda'$. Consider the subcategory $\operatorname{HC}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})^{ss}_{\Lambda'} \subset \operatorname{HC}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})$ consisting of all semisimple objects with left and right central characters lying in Λ'. According to [LO], this category is isomorphic to the category $\operatorname{Coh}^{\bar{A}}(Y^{\Lambda'} \times Y^{\Lambda'})$ of $\bar{A}$-equivariant sheaves of finite dimensional vector spaces on $Y^{\Lambda'} \times Y^{\Lambda'}$, where $Y^{\Lambda'}$ is the set of finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules with central character in Λ'. Irreducible objects in the latter are parameterized by triples $(x, y, \mathcal{V})$, where $x, y \in Y^{\Lambda'}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ is an irreducible $\bar{A}_{(x,y)}$-module, a triple is defined up to $\bar{A}$-conjugacy. So any irreducible Harish-Chandra bimodule in $\operatorname{HC}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})_\Lambda$ gets mapped to some triple $(x, y, \mathcal{V})$. We say that this triple corresponds to the bimodule (or to (w, λ) if the bimodule is $\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda) := L(\Delta(\varrho), L(w\lambda))$ or just to w if $\lambda = \varrho$; the triple does not depend on the choice of ϱ). Theorem 1.3.1 from [Lo2] implies that x, y lie over the left and right annihilators of $\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda)$, those $J(w\lambda), J(w^{-1}\varrho)$. Moreover, the construction in [LO] implies that $\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda)$ gets mapped to the sheaf supported on the diagonal of the $\bar{A}$-orbit corresponding to $J(w\lambda)$, whose fiber is the trivial module. In particular, if d is the Duflo involution in c_w, then the triple corresponding to d has the form $(x, x, triv)$. This is because $\mathcal{M}_d$ coincides with $\mathcal{U}/J(d\varrho)$ in $\mathrm{HC}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})$ (the latter basically follows from the definition of this involution, see, for instance, [Jo1], 3.3 and 3.4, and the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence).

A important corollary from [LO] is a formula for the multiplicity of an irreducible object $\mathcal{M}$ in $\mathrm{HC}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U})_\Lambda$, see Remark 7.5 and formula (7.1) in loc. cit. Namely, let $(x, y, \mathcal{V})$ be a triple corresponding to $\mathcal{M}$. Then we have

$$\mathrm{mult}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{M}) = d_x d_y \frac{|\bar{A}|}{|\bar{A}_{(x,y)}|} \dim \mathcal{V}. \tag{2.1}$$

Here d_x, d_y are the dimensions of irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules lying over the left and the right annihilators of $\mathcal{M}$. This formula will be one of the crucial tools to relate the Goldie ranks and the dimensions of $\mathcal{W}$-irreducibles.

2.5. **Parabolic induction.** Recall the Lusztig-Spaltenstein induction, [LS]. Take a Levi subalgebra $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ and a nilpotent orbit $\underline{\mathbb{O}} \subset \underline{\mathfrak{g}}$. One can construct a nilpotent orbit $\mathbb{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ (called *induced* from $\underline{\mathbb{O}}$) from this pair as follows. Pick a parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ with Levi subalgebra $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$. Let $\mathfrak{n}$ stand for the maximal nilpotent subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}$. For $\mathbb{O}$ we take a unique dense orbit in $G(\underline{\mathbb{O}} + \mathfrak{n})$. It turns out that $\mathbb{O}$ does not depend on the choice of $\mathfrak{p}$. The codimension of $\mathbb{O}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ coincides with the codimension of $\underline{\mathbb{O}}$ in $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$. The intersection of $\mathbb{O}$ with $\underline{\mathbb{O}} + \mathfrak{n}$ is a single P-orbit, see [LS].

Let $\underline{\mathcal{W}}$ denote the W-algebra of the pair $(\underline{\mathfrak{g}}, \underline{\mathbb{O}})$. In [Lo4] we have constructed a dimension preserving exact functor $\varsigma : \underline{\mathcal{W}}\text{-mod}_{fin} \to \mathcal{W}\text{-mod}_{fin}$ between the categories of finite dimensional modules. This functor depends on the choice of P. Namely, see [Lo4], Subsection 6.3, there is a completion $\underline{\mathcal{W}}'$ of $\underline{\mathcal{W}}$ such that any finite dimensional $\underline{\mathcal{W}}$-module extends to $\underline{\mathcal{W}}'$ and an embedding $\Xi : \mathcal{W} \hookrightarrow \underline{\mathcal{W}}'$. The functor under consideration is just the pull-back from $\underline{\mathcal{W}}'$ to $\mathcal{W}$. Furthermore, we may choose $e \in \mathbb{O} \cap (\underline{\mathbb{O}} + \mathfrak{n})$ in such a way that a reductive part $\underline{Q}$ of the centralizer $Z_P(e)$ lies in the Levi subgroup $\underline{G}$ of P corresponding to $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$. The group $\underline{Q}$ acts on $\underline{\mathcal{W}}$ by automorphisms, the action extends to $\underline{\mathcal{W}}'$, and the embedding $\mathcal{W} \to \underline{\mathcal{W}}'$ is $\underline{Q}$-equivariant (the latter can be deduced directly from the construction of Ξ in [Lo4], Theorem 6.3.2).

2.6. **Isomorphisms of completions.**

2.6.1. *Setting.* Let us fix a setting that will be used until Section 5.

Let $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ be a nilpotent element. We include e into a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ so that e is an even nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. For example, this is always the case when e is distinguished in $\mathfrak{g}_0$, equivalently, $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is a minimal Levi subalgebra containing e, see, for example, [CM, Theorem 8.2.3].

Choose an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e, h, f) in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Choose Cartan and Borel subalgebras $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{b}_0 \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$ in such a way that $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ and is a dominant (for $\mathfrak{g}_0$) element there. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ stand for the eigendecomposition for h.

Pick an integral element $\theta \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ such that $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\theta) = \mathfrak{g}_0$. Consider the eigen-decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_i$. Set $\mathfrak{b} := \mathfrak{b}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{>0}$, where $\mathfrak{g}_{>0} := \bigoplus_{i>0} \mathfrak{g}_i$, clearly, $\mathfrak{b}$ is a Borel subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$. Further, set $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{g}_0(\geqslant 0) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{>0}$. This is a parabolic subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$. Let P denote the corresponding parabolic subgroup of G.

Let σ be the anti-involution of $\mathfrak{g}$ defined as follows: $\sigma|_{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathrm{id}, \sigma(e_i) = f_i, \sigma(f_i) = e_i$. We claim that one can choose e and f in such a way that $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ is still dominant for $\mathfrak{g}_0$, $\sigma(e) = f$ and hence $\sigma(f) = e$. We remark that h is fixed by σ because σ is the identity on $\mathfrak{h}$. So a result of Antonyan, [A], implies that e is conjugate to a σ-invariant, say e'. The element e' can be included into an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e', h', f') in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ with $\sigma(e') = e', \sigma(f') = f', \sigma(h') = -h'$. In other words, on the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-subalgebra with standard basis e', h', f' the antiautomorphism σ acts as the transposition with respect to the anti-diagonal. It is conjugate to the usual transposition. So we can find the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple e'', h'', f'' in that $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-subalgebra with $\sigma(e'') = f''$. Now we can replace (e, h, f) with (e'', h'', f''). Further, we can conjugate such h to $\mathfrak{h}$. The Weyl group of the symmetric pair $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0^{-\sigma})$ is identified with the original Weyl group W. So we can assume that h is dominant and we are done. Clearly, σ lifts to G.

Let n be the image of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ under the homomorphism $\mathrm{SL}_2 \to G$ corresponding to the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (e, h, f). The matrix is symmetric and therefore $\sigma(n) = n$. It follows that $\tau : g \mapsto n\sigma(g)n^{-1}$ is involutive. This is our choice of τ from now on and until Section 6.

Recall that we write $\mathfrak{t}$ for the center $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_0)$.

In the next two parts we establish certain isomorphisms of various algebras. In the rest of the paper we will always assume that the algebras are identified as explained below in this subsection.

2.6.2. *Right-handed completions.* Define a subalgebra $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ as follows. $\mathfrak{m} := \mathfrak{g}_0(< 0) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{>0}$ (in [Lo3] this subalgebra was denoted by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{m}}$, while the notation $\mathfrak{m}$ was only used in the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$, but we want to simplify the notation here). Let us point out that χ is a character of $\mathfrak{m}$. Also we consider the shift of $\mathfrak{m}$, the subspace $\mathfrak{m}_\chi := \{x - \langle \chi, x\rangle, x \in \mathfrak{m}\} \subset \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{K}$.

We will need a completion of $\mathcal{U}$ considered in [Lo3]: $\mathcal{U}^\wedge := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{U}\mathfrak{m}_\chi^n$. This is a topological algebra.

We can decompose $\mathcal{U}^\wedge$ into a completed tensor product as follows. As we have noticed in [Lo3], $\mathfrak{v} := \mathfrak{m} \cap V$ is a lagrangian subspace in V. Thanks to the embedding $\mathfrak{q} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ we can view θ as an element of $\mathcal{W}$ and consider the eigen-decomposition $\mathcal{W} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{W}_i$. Then we set $\mathcal{W}^\wedge := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}\mathcal{W}_{>0}^n, \mathbb{A}^\wedge := \varprojlim_n \mathbb{A}/\mathbb{A}\mathfrak{v}^n$. We have seen in [Lo3, Section 5] (compare with [Lo1, Sections 3.2,3.3]), the decomposition $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi} = \mathbb{A}_\hbar(V)^{\wedge_\chi} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]} \mathcal{W}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ gives rise to an isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$, where we write $\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ for $\mathbb{A}^\wedge \widehat{\otimes} \mathcal{W}^\wedge$, of course, $\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ is the completion of $\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathcal{W}$ with respect to the left ideals $\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathcal{W}(\mathfrak{v} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \mathcal{W}_{>0})^n$. The isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ maps the left ideal $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \mathfrak{m}_\chi$ to $\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge(\mathfrak{v} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \mathcal{W}_{>0})$.

Let us recall how the isomorphism is constructed. We embed $\mathbb{K}^\times$ into $\mathbb{K}^\times \times Q$ with differential $(1, -N\theta)$ for N large enough. Then we can consider the subalgebras

$$(\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi})_{fin}, (\mathbb{A}_\hbar(V)^{\wedge_0} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]} \mathcal{W}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi})_{fin}$$

of $\mathbb{K}^\times$-finite vectors. We mod out $\hbar - 1$ and get isomorphic algebras to be denoted by $\mathcal{U}^\heartsuit, \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\heartsuit$. They are embedded into $\mathcal{U}^\wedge, \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$. Then the isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\heartsuit \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\heartsuit$ extends by continuity to an isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ and this isomorphism has the required behavior on the ideal.

The isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ induces another isomorphism. Namely, we write $\mathcal{U}^0$ for $U(\mathfrak{g}_0)$. Also we set $\mathcal{W}_{\geqslant 0} := \bigoplus_{i \geqslant 0} \mathcal{W}_i$ and $\mathcal{W}^0 := \mathcal{W}_{\geqslant 0}/(\mathcal{W}_{\geqslant 0} \cap \mathcal{W}\mathcal{W}_{>0}) = \mathcal{W}_0/(\mathcal{W}_0 \cap \mathcal{W}_{<0}\mathcal{W}_{>0})$. As we have noticed in [Lo3, Section 5], the identification $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ induces an isomorphism of $\mathcal{W}^0$ and $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e) := [\mathcal{U}^0/\mathcal{U}^0\mathfrak{m}_\chi^0]^{M^0}$, where $\mathfrak{m}^0 := \mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$. The algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ (a W-algebra, as defined by Premet in [Pr1]) is identified with the W-algebra for $\mathfrak{g}_0$

in our sense via an isomorphism of completions analogous to $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ but taken for $\mathfrak{g}_0$ and not for $\mathfrak{g}$.

The isomorphism $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{W}^0$ is R-equivariant but does not intertwine the quantum comoment maps $\mathfrak{r} \to U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e), \mathcal{W}^0$. Here the quantum comoment map $\mathfrak{r} \to U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ is obtained as the composition $\mathfrak{r} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{U}^0 \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{U}^0/\mathcal{U}^0\mathfrak{m}^0_\chi$, while the quantum comoment map $\mathfrak{r} \to \mathcal{W}^0$ is the composition $\mathfrak{r} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W} \to \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}\mathcal{W}_{>0}$. Instead the isomorphism induces a shift on $\mathfrak{r}$ by a certain character δ, compare with [Lo3, Remark 5.5], i.e., it maps $\xi \in \mathfrak{r} \hookrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ to $\xi - \langle \delta, \xi\rangle$. Our setting is a bit different from loc. cit., as we consider a larger algebra here. So we are going to provide details.

Let us write $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}, \iota_{\mathcal{W}}, \iota_{\mathbb{A}}$ for the quantum comoment maps to the corresponding algebras (this differs a bit from the conventions of Subsection 2.1) so that under the isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$, we have $\iota_{\mathcal{U}} = \iota_{\mathbb{A}} + \iota_{\mathcal{W}}$. A key observation is that the map $[\mathbb{A}/\mathbb{A}\mathfrak{v}]^{\mathfrak{v}}$ induced by $\iota_{\mathbb{A}}$ is the character δ that, by definition, equals a half of the character of $\bigwedge^{top}\mathfrak{v}^*$ (see [Lo3, Remark 5.5] for a computation). In particular, the restriction of δ to $\mathfrak{t}$ is the same character as in loc.cit. (we remark that $\mathfrak{t}$ is naturally represented as a direct summand of $\mathfrak{r}$). So the map $\mathfrak{r} \to \mathcal{W}^\wedge = [\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge/\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge\mathfrak{v}]^{\mathfrak{v}}$ induced by $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$ equals $\iota_{\mathcal{W}} + \delta$. This implies the claim in the previous paragraph.

2.6.3. *Left-handed completions.* Set $\bar{\mathfrak{m}} := \tau(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{g}_{<0} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0(<0)$. Define the completion ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{U}/\bar{\mathfrak{m}}^n_\chi\mathcal{U}$. Also set $\bar{\mathfrak{v}} := \tau(\mathfrak{m}) \cap V$, this is again a lagrangian subspace in V. Set ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A} := \varprojlim_n \mathbb{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^n\mathbb{A}$, ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W} := \varprojlim_n \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}^n_{<0}\mathcal{W}$, where $\mathcal{W}_{<0} := \bigoplus_{i<0}\mathcal{W}_i$. Twisting the isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ with τ, we get an isomorphism ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W}) := {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}\widehat{\otimes}\,{}^\wedge\mathcal{W}$.

Again, below we will need several isomorphisms induced by ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$. We can form the analogous completions ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0$ of $\mathcal{U}^0$, ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}^0$ of $\mathbb{A}^0 := \mathbb{A}(V^0)$, where $V^0 := \mathfrak{g}_0 \cap V = [\mathfrak{g}_0, e]$. Also we can consider the eigen-spaces ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_i$, ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}_i$, ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W}_i$ for the action of $\operatorname{ad}(\theta)$ (in the case of ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}$ rather of the corresponding one-dimensional torus). Then we can define the subalgebras ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{\leqslant 0} := \bigoplus_{i\leqslant 0}{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_i$, ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}_{\leqslant 0}$, ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W}_{\leqslant 0}$ and their ideals ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{<0}$, ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}_{<0}$, ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W}_{<0}$ similarly to $\mathcal{W}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{W}_{>0}$. We claim that

$$ {}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{\leqslant 0}/({}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{\leqslant 0} \cap {}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{<0}\,{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}) = {}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_0/({}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_0 \cap {}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{<0}\,{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{>0}) $$

is naturally identified with ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0$ and the similar equalities hold for the other two algebras (in the $\mathcal{W}$-case we have, by definition, ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W}^0 := \mathcal{W}^0$).

We are going to prove the isomorphism in the $\mathcal{U}$-case, the other two cases are similar. The algebra ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}$ can be realized "explicitly" as follows. Choose a basis $x_1, \ldots, x_a, y_1, \ldots, y_b$, $z_1, \ldots, z_c, w_1, \ldots, w_d$ of $\mathfrak{g}_\chi := \{x - \langle \chi, x\rangle | x \in \mathfrak{g}\}$ such that

- $x_1, \ldots, x_a$ are weight vectors for θ with negative weights, $y_1, \ldots, y_b, z_1, \ldots, z_c \in \mathfrak{g}_0$, while $w_1, \ldots, w_d$ are weight vectors for θ with positive weights.
- $y_1, \ldots, y_b$ form a basis in $\mathfrak{m}^0_\chi$.

Then ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}$ consists of all infinite sums $\sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta} n_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}x^\alpha y^\beta z^\gamma w^\delta$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_a), x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots x_a^{\alpha_a}$ etc., subject to the condition that for any given α, β only finitely many coefficients $n_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ are nonzero. The product is induced (=extended by continuity) from $\mathcal{U}$.

The quotient ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}/{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\,{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{>0}$ consists of the infinite sums of the form $\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} n_{\alpha\beta\gamma}x^\alpha y^\beta z^\gamma$ with the same finiteness condition as above. So ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0$ consists of the sums $\sum_{\beta\gamma} n_{\beta\gamma}y^\beta z^\gamma$ (with product induced from $\mathcal{U}$ or, equivalently, $\mathcal{U}^0$) and is naturally identified with ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0$.

The algebra ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})_0/({}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})_0 \cap {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})_{<0} \cap {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})_{>0})$ is naturally identified with ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}^0(\mathcal{W}^0) = {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}^0\widehat{\otimes}\mathcal{W}^0$. It follows that the isomorphism ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$ induces an isomorphism ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0 \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}^0(\mathcal{W}^0)$. Moreover, it also induces an isomorphism ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}/{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\,{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{>0} \xrightarrow{\sim} {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})/{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})\,{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})_{>0}$

that is linear both over ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$ (acting on the left) and over ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0 \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}^0(\mathcal{W}^0)$ (acting on the right).

Finally, similarly to 2.6.2, the isomorphism ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$ induces an isomorphism of $U(e, \mathfrak{g}_0) := [\mathcal{U}^0/\mathfrak{m}^0_\chi \mathcal{U}^0]^{M^0}$ and $\mathcal{W}^0$. Again, this isomorphism is R-equivariant but does not intertwine the embeddings of $\mathfrak{t}$. Rather it again induces a shift by $\tau(\delta)$. The elements δ and $\tau(\delta)$ are different but they agree on $\mathfrak{t}$ and their difference is a character of R.

3. Categories

3.1. **Parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$.**

3.1.1. *Definition.* Recall that G denotes a connected reductive algebraic group and that we have fixed a parabolic subgroup $P \subset G$. Fix a character ν of $\mathfrak{p}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^P_\nu$ denote the full subcategory in the category of $(\mathfrak{g}, P)$-modules consisting of all modules $\mathcal{M}$ where the ν-shifted $\mathfrak{p}$-action, i.e., $(x, m) \mapsto xm - \nu(x)m$, is locally finite and integrates to the action of P. Inside $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^P_\nu$ we consider the full subcategory of all modules where all weight spaces (for $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$, where $\mathfrak{l}$ is a Levi subalgebra of P, or, equivalently, for a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$) are finite dimensional. Equivalently, $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ consists of all finitely generated modules in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^P_\nu$. It is known that all modules in $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ have finite length.

Consider the category $\mathcal{O}^L_\nu$ of all $\mathfrak{l}$- and L-modules, where the differential of the L-action coincides with the ν-shifted $\mathfrak{l}$-action. We have the induction functor $\Delta_P : \mathcal{O}^L_\nu \to \mathcal{O}^P_\nu, \mathcal{M}^0 \mapsto \mathcal{U} \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{p})} \mathcal{M}^0$. For the irreducible module $L_{\mathfrak{l}}(\lambda)$ with highest weight $\lambda - \rho$ we write $\Delta_P(\lambda)$ for $\Delta_P(L_{\mathfrak{l}}(\lambda))$, this is, of course, a parabolic Verma module. It has a unique irreducible quotient to be denoted by $L(\lambda)$.

3.1.2. *Completed version.* We consider a category $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^P_\nu$ consisting of all topological $\mathcal{U}$- and P-modules $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. The weights of $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ in $\mathcal{M}$ are bounded from above in the sense that there is an element θ in $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ such that $\operatorname{ad}\theta$ has only positive integral eigenvalues on the nilpotent radical of $\mathfrak{p}$ and all eigenvalues of θ on $\mathcal{M}$ are bounded from above.
2. Any $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$-weight spaces is finite dimensional.
3. The ν-shifted $\mathfrak{l}$-action on any weight space coincides with the differential of the L-action.
4. $\mathcal{M}$ (considered as a topological $\mathcal{U}$-module) is the direct product of its $\mathfrak{t}$-weight subspaces.

We have a completion functor $\mathcal{M} \mapsto \widehat{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu \to \hat{\mathcal{O}}^P_\nu$ that sends $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_\mu \mathcal{M}_\mu$, where $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is a weight space corresponding to $\mu \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ to $\prod_\mu \mathcal{M}_\mu$. This functor is an equivalence of categories.

3.1.3. *Right-handed versions.* We will also consider the analogs $\mathcal{O}^{P,r}, \hat{\mathcal{O}}^{P,r}$ of $\mathcal{O}^P, \hat{\mathcal{O}}^P$ consisting of right modules.

3.1.4. *Duality.* We have a contravariant duality functor $\bullet^\vee : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu \to \mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. Namely, recall the anti-automorphism $\sigma : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$, see 2.6.1. In particular, it sends P to the opposite parabolic subgroup P^-. For $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathfrak{t}^*} \mathcal{M}_\mu$ the restricted dual $\mathcal{M}^{(*)} := \bigoplus_\mu \mathcal{M}^*_\mu \subset \mathcal{M}_\mu$ is a right $\mathcal{U}$-module that lies in $\mathcal{O}^{P^-,r}$. The twist $\mathcal{M}^\vee := {}^\sigma\mathcal{M}^{(*)}$ is therefore again an object of $\mathcal{O}^P$. It is known that $L(\lambda)^\vee \cong L(\lambda)$, while $\Delta(\lambda)^\vee$ is a costandard (=dual Verma) module $\nabla(\lambda)$.

3.1.5. *Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence.* Here we are going to recall the classical Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence relating the full BGG category $\mathcal{O}_\nu$ with a certain category $\operatorname{HC}(\mathcal{U})^\nu$ of Harish-Chandra bimodules. Then we introduce recall its parabolic analog. This analog should be known but we did not find any reference.

Let $\operatorname{HC}(\mathcal{U})^\varrho$ denote the category of all HC bimodules with right central character ϱ. Assume that ϱ is strictly dominant meaning that $\langle \varrho, \alpha^\vee\rangle \not\in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for any positive root α. Then the functor $X \mapsto X\otimes_{\mathcal{U}}\Delta(\varrho)$ is an equivalence $\operatorname{HC}(\mathcal{U})^\varrho \to \mathcal{O}_\varrho$, see [BG, 5.9]. The quasi-inverse equivalence is given by $\mathcal{M}\mapsto L(\Delta(\varrho),\mathcal{M})$, where $L(\bullet,\bullet)$ denotes the space of $\mathfrak{g}$-finite maps.

Now let us proceed to a parabolic analog of this. Suppose we are given a parabolic category $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. Adding a suitable character of P to ν, we may assume that $\nu+\rho$ is strictly dominant (we remark that ν is 0 on the roots of $\mathfrak{l}$). Let $\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ denote the annihilator of $\Delta_{P,\nu}:=\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ in $\mathcal{U}$. Consider the subcategory $\operatorname{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}}$ of $\operatorname{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\nu+\rho}$ consisting of all bimodules annihilated by $\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$. Since $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)=\Delta(\nu+\rho)/\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}\Delta(\nu+\rho)$, this functor can be written as $X\mapsto X\otimes_{\mathcal{U}}\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$. So the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence restricts to a functor $\operatorname{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}}\to\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$.

For reader's convenience, let us recall the proof of the equality $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)=\Delta(\nu+\rho)/\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}\Delta(\nu+\rho)$. First, we have a natural epimorphism $\Delta(\nu+\rho)\twoheadrightarrow\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ that factors through $\Delta(\nu+\rho)/\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}\Delta(\nu+\rho)$. The latter corresponds to $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ under the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence. The ideal $\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ is primitive. Indeed, $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ is isomorphic to $U(\mathfrak{g}_{<0})$ as a $U(\mathfrak{g}_{<0})$-module. So its GK multiplicity is 1 and hence the socle of $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ is simple. The latter proves that $\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ is primitive. It follows that any proper quotient of $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ has Gelfand-Kirillov (below we just write GK) dimension smaller than that of $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ (equal to $\dim\mathfrak{g}-\dim\mathfrak{l}$). It follows that $\Delta(\nu+\rho)/\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}\Delta(\nu+\rho)$ has simple socle and the quotient by this socle has GK dimension less then $\frac{1}{2}(\dim\mathfrak{g}-\dim\mathfrak{l})$. Since the GK dimension of $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ equals $\frac{1}{2}(\dim\mathfrak{g}-\dim\mathfrak{l})$ the required equality follows.

Since $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ is the largest quotient of $\Delta(\nu+\rho)$ lying in $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$, we see that $\mathcal{M}\mapsto L(\Delta(\nu+\rho),\mathcal{M})=L(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho),\mathcal{M})$ is a quasi-inverse functor to $X\mapsto X\otimes_{\mathcal{U}}\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$.

3.2. Category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$ and Whittaker modules I: non-completed version.

3.2.1. *Categories $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e),\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$.* We will define the full categories $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu\subset\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ in the category of left $\mathcal{W}$-modules. Namely, recall that $\mathfrak{q}$ and hence $\mathfrak{t}=\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}_0)\subset\mathfrak{q}$ are naturally included into $\mathcal{W}$.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$ stand for the category of all $\mathcal{W}$-modules $\mathcal{N}$ such that

1. $\mathfrak{t}$ acts on $\mathcal{N}$ diaglonalizably and with eigenvalues lying in $\mathfrak{X}(P)+\nu+\delta$.
2. The collection of integers $\langle\mu-\nu-\delta,\theta\rangle$, where μ is a $\mathfrak{t}$-weight of $\mathcal{N}$, is bounded from above.

Below we write $\mathcal{N}_\mu$ for the weight space with weight $\mu+\delta$.

By definition, the subcategory $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu\subset\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ consists of all modules with finite dimensional weight spaces. This is, basically, the category that appeared in [BGK, 4.4] (they considered the case when θ is generic in $\mathfrak{q}$ but the general case is completely analogous). In particular, every object in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ has finite length and so is finitely generated.

To an object $\mathcal{N}\in\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ we can assign its formal character $\operatorname{ch}(\mathcal{N}):=\sum_\mu(\dim\mathcal{N}_\mu)e^\mu$, where the summation is taken over $\mu\in\mathfrak{t}^*$.

3.2.2. *Verma modules and their characters.* Recall that $\mathcal{W}^0$ is identified with the W-algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ for $\mathfrak{g}_0$. The category $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$ is just the category of finite dimensional $U(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$-modules, where $\mathfrak{t}$ acts diagonalizably with weights in $\mathfrak{X}(P) + \nu$.

We have the induction functor (to be called a *Verma functor*) $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}} : \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu \to \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$ that maps $\mathcal{N}^0 \in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$ to $\mathcal{W} \otimes_{\mathcal{W}_{\geqslant 0}} \mathcal{N}^0$, where we view $\mathcal{N}^0$ as a $\mathcal{W}_{\geqslant 0}$-module via the projection $\mathcal{W}_{\geqslant 0} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{W}^0$. Of course, $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$ maps $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$ to $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$.

The functor $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$ is right exact. It has a right adjoint functor that maps $\mathcal{N}$ to the annihilator $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{W}_{>0}}$ of $\mathcal{W}_{>0}$. It turns out that the functor $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$ is exact and, moreover, one can compute the character of $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$.

Namely, consider the decomposition $\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e)_i$ and set $\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e)_{<0} = \bigoplus_{i<0} \mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e)_i$. Pick a basis $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ of $\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e)_{<0}$ consisting of weight vectors for $\mathfrak{t}$. Recall that $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{W} = \mathbb{K}[S] = S(\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e))$. Lift the elements $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ to $\mathfrak{t}$-weight vectors $\tilde{f}_1, \ldots, \tilde{f}_k$ in $\mathcal{W}$.

The following is a straightforward generalization of assertion (1) of [BGK, Theorem 4.5].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ be a basis in $\mathcal{N}^0$ The elements $\tilde{f}_1^{n_1} \ldots \tilde{f}_k^{n_k} v_i$, where $i = 1, \ldots, m$, and $n_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$, form a basis in $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$.*

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{t}$ acts on $\mathcal{N}^0$ with a single weight, say μ_0, and let $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k$ be the weights of $\tilde{f}_1, \ldots, \tilde{f}_k$, respectively. Then*

$$\operatorname{ch} \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0) = e^{\mu_0} \dim \mathcal{N}^0 \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 - e^{\mu_i})^{-1}.$$

Corollary 3.3. *The functor $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$ is exact.*

Also we remark that, for $\mathcal{N}^0 \in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$, $\mathcal{N}^0$ is naturally embedded into $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$. There is the maximal submodule of $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ that does not intersect $\mathcal{N}^0$, the quotient to be denoted by $L^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$. The modules $L^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ form a complete list of simple objects in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$. Since any object in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$ has finite length, we see that $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$ coincides with the Serre subcategory of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$ generated by $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$.

3.2.3. *Categories* $\tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e), \mathrm{Wh}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Recall the subalgebra $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{g}_{>0} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0(< 0)$ and its character χ. Consider the full subcategory $\tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$ in the category of left $\mathcal{U}$-modules consisting of all modules $\mathcal{M}$ such that

(1) The shift $\mathfrak{m}_\chi = \{\xi - \langle \xi, \chi \rangle, \xi \in \mathfrak{m}\}$ acts locally nilpotently on $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) $\mathfrak{t}$ acts diagonalizably on $\mathcal{M}$ with weights in $\mathfrak{X}(P) + \nu$.

One can define an analog of a Verma module in $\tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Namely, take $\mathcal{N}^0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$. Then we have Skryabin's equivalence (see 3.2.4 below) $\mathcal{S}_0 : \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$. We set $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{N}^0) := \mathcal{U} \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{\geqslant 0})} \mathcal{S}_0(\mathcal{N}^0)$. The functor $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$ admits a right adjoint, the functor $\mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}_\chi}$.

By definition, for $\mathrm{Wh}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$ we take the Serre subcategory of $\tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$ generated by the modules $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ with $\mathcal{N}^0 \in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$.

3.2.4. *Equivalences.* In [Lo3] we have produced an equivalence $\mathcal{K} : \tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu \to \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$. In the case when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$, the equivalence $\mathcal{K}$ becomes an equivalence introduced by Skryabin in an appendix to [Pr1].

To construct $\mathcal{K}$, recall the isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$. The category $\tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$ is nothing else but the category of topological $\mathcal{U}^\wedge$-modules with respect to the discrete topology, where

$\mathfrak{t}$ acts diagonalizably with weights in $\mathfrak{X}(P)+\nu$. In particular, we can view $\mathcal{M}\in \tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ as a module over $\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$. Then we define $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M})$ as $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{v}}$. A quasi-inverse functor is given by $\mathcal{N}\mapsto \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{v}]\otimes\mathcal{N}$. Here $\mathbb{A}$ acts on $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{v}]$ via the identification $\mathbb{A}\cong D(\mathfrak{v})$, or equivalently, $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{v}]=\mathbb{A}/\mathbb{A}\mathfrak{v}$.

According to the main result of [Lo3], the functor $\mathcal{K}_e$ intertwines the functors $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}},\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$. It follows that $\mathcal{K}$ induces an equivalence of $\mathrm{Wh}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ and $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ because both these subcategories are defined in terms of $\Delta^\theta_\bullet$.

3.2.5. *Equivariant version.* Set $R:=Q\cap G_0$, this is a reductive subgroup in G_0 (and a maximal reductive subgroup of $Q\cap P$). We can consider the R-equivariant versions of the categories under consideration. For example, by an R-equivairiant object in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ we mean a module $\mathcal{N}\in\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$ equipped with an action of R that makes the structure map $\mathcal{W}\times\mathcal{N}\to\mathcal{N}$ into an R-equivariant map and such that the differential of the R-action (defined in both completed and non-completed settings) coincides with the action of $\mathfrak{r}\subset\mathcal{W}$ (shifted by $\nu+\delta$; for Whittaker categories we just consider a shift by ν). The R-equivariant categories will be denoted by $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$, etc. Since the isomorphism $\mathcal{U}^\wedge\cong\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ is R-equivariant, we see that $\mathcal{K}$ upgrades to an equivalence of equivariant categories. Let us also mention that the Verma module functors are lifted to the equivariant categories, i.e., for, say, $\mathcal{N}^0\in\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$, the Verma module $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ has a natural R-equivariant structure.

3.2.6. *Duality for $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$.* Here we are going to define a contravariant involutive equivalence $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu\to\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$. We are going to use conventions of 2.6.1. In particular, $\mathfrak{t}\subset\mathfrak{h}$.

To $\mathcal{N}\in\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ we can assign its restricted dual $\mathcal{N}^{(*)}=\bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathfrak{t}^*}\mathcal{N}^*_\mu\subset\mathcal{N}^*$. Recall that τ fixes $\mathfrak{h}$ and hence $\mathfrak{t}$. The twist $\mathcal{N}^\vee:={}^\tau\mathcal{N}^{(*)}$ is therefore an object in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$. Since $\tau^2=1$, we see that $\bullet^\vee$ is involutive.

Also it follows directly from the construction that $\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{N})=\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{N}^\vee)$.

A pairing $\mathcal{N}_1\times\mathcal{N}_2\to\mathbb{K}$ is called *contravariant* (or τ-contravariant) if $\langle\tau(a)n_1,n_2\rangle=\langle n_1,an_2\rangle$ for all $a\in\mathcal{W},n_i\in\mathcal{N}_i,i=1,2$. For example, there is a natural contravariant pairing $\mathcal{N}^\vee\times\mathcal{N}\to\mathbb{K}$.

The following lemma characterizes the module $\mathcal{N}^\vee$ up to an isomorphism.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{N}\in\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu,\mathcal{N}_1\in\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$. Suppose that there is a contravariant pairing $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle:\mathcal{N}\times\mathcal{N}_1\to\mathbb{K}$ with zero left and right kernels. Then there is a unique isomorphism $\mathcal{N}^\vee\xrightarrow{\sim}\mathcal{N}_1$ that intertwines the pairing $\mathcal{N}_1\times\mathcal{N}\to\mathbb{K}$ with a natural pairing $\mathcal{N}^\vee\times\mathcal{N}\to\mathbb{K}$.*

The proof is straightforward.

Let us finish by noting that $\bullet^\vee$ naturally upgrades to an equivalence of R-equivariant categories.

3.3. **Category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathcal{W}$ and Whittaker modules II: completed version.**

3.3.1. *Categories $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e),\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$.* By definition, the category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ consists of all $\mathcal{W}$-modules $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\mathcal{M}$ is complete and separated with respect to the $\mathcal{W}_{<0}$-adic topology.
2. The eigenvalues of $\mathfrak{t}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ are in $\mathfrak{X}(P)+\nu+\delta$ and are bounded from above (in the sense that $\langle\theta,\mu-\nu-\delta\rangle$ is bounded for a weight μ).
3. $\mathcal{M}$ (considered as a topological $\mathcal{W}$-module with respect to the $\mathcal{W}_{<0}$-adic topology) is the direct product of its $\mathfrak{t}$-weight subspaces (where the latter is considered with the direct product topology).

Inside $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ we consider the full subcategory $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ consisting of all modules with finite dimensional weight spaces. We again have a completion functor $\mathcal{N}\mapsto\widehat{\mathcal{N}}:\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu\to\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ that sends $\mathcal{N}=\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{N}_\mu$, to $\prod_\mu\mathcal{N}_\mu$. The only claim that one needs to check in order to verify $\widehat{\mathcal{N}}\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ is that the $\mathcal{W}_{<0}$-adic topology on $\widehat{\mathcal{N}}$ is complete and separated. But this is straightforward from the decomposition into the product of weight spaces.

Lemma 3.5. *The functor $\widehat{\bullet}$ coincides with the functor of $\mathcal{W}_{<0}$-adic completion, $\mathcal{N}\mapsto\varprojlim_n\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{W}_{<0}^n\mathcal{N}$ and is an equivalence of categories.*

Proof. Let us check the claim about an equivalence. For $\mathcal{N}'\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$, let $\mathcal{N}'_{fin}$ denote the subspace of $\mathfrak{t}$-finite elements. In other words, $\mathcal{N}'_{fin}=\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{N}'_\mu$. Clearly, $\mathcal{N}'_{fin}$ is an object of $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ and the functor $\bullet_{fin}$ is quasi-inverse to $\widehat{\bullet}$.

Now let us check that $\widehat{\bullet}$ coincides with the $\mathcal{W}_{<0}$-adic completion functor. Any object in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ is generated by finitely many weight vectors as a $\mathcal{W}_{\leqslant 0}$-module. From this observation it is easy to deduce the coincidence under consideration. ☐

We have a Verma functor $\hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}:\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)_\nu\to\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$. On $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)_\nu$, is just $\mathcal{N}^0\mapsto\widehat{\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)}$. On the other hand, (this follows, for example, from Lemma 3.5)

$$\hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)=[{}^\wedge\mathcal{W}/{}^\wedge\mathcal{W}\,{}^\wedge\mathcal{W}_{>0}]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{W}^0}\mathcal{N}^0.$$

Thanks to the equivalence $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu\cong\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$, we see that $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ coincides with the Serre subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ generated by $\hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ with $\mathcal{N}^0\in\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)_\nu$.

3.3.2. *Category $\widehat{\operatorname{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)$ and equivalence $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$.* Now we are going to define a category $\widehat{\operatorname{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ and show that it is equivalent to $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$.

Recall the subalgebra $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}:=\mathfrak{g}_{<0}\oplus\mathfrak{g}_0(<0)=\tau(\mathfrak{m})$. Let $\widehat{\operatorname{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ consist of all ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}$-modules $\mathcal{M}$ such that

1. The $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_\chi$-adic topology on $\mathcal{M}$ is separated and complete.
2. The weights of $\mathfrak{t}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ are integral after the ν-shift and are bounded from above.
3. As a topological module, $\mathcal{M}$ is the direct product of its $\mathfrak{t}$-weight spaces.

We are going to construct an equivalence $\hat{\mathcal{K}}:\widehat{\operatorname{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu\to\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$. This functor will be produced as a restriction of an equivalence between the categories ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}$-csMod of ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}$-modules that are complete and separated in the $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_\chi$-adic topology and the category ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W}$-csMod of ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W}$-modules that are complete and separated in the $\mathcal{W}_{<0}$-adic topology.

Recall the isomorphism ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\cong{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$. Under this isomorphism, an equivalence $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$: ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}-$csMod $\to{}^\wedge\mathcal{W}$-csMod is given by taking the $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}$-coinvariants. A quasi-inverse equivalence looks as follows. Choose a lagrangian subspace $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*\subset V$ complimentary to $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}$. Then $\mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*]]={}^\wedge\mathbb{A}/{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*$ is a ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}$-module (independent of the choice of $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*$ up to an isomorphism). A quasi-inverse equivalence sends $\mathcal{N}$ to $\mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*]]\widehat{\otimes}\mathcal{N}$.

The claim that the two functors are quasi-inverse to each other reduces to the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let U be a finite dimensional vector space and M be a module over the algebra $D(U)$ of differential operators on U. Suppose that M is complete and separated with respect to the U^*-adic topology. Then M decomposes into the product of $\mathbb{K}[[U]]$ and some complete separated topological vector space M_0 (with trivial action of $D(U)$).*

The proof is very similar to (and is a slight generalization of) the proof of [LO, Lemma 5.14] but we will provide it for reader's convenience.

Proof. By induction, compare with loc.cit., we reduce the proof to the case when $\dim U = 1$. Let p be a basis vector in U and $q \in U^*$ be the dual basis vector so that $[p, q] = 1$. Set $r := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} q^i p^i$, this is a well-defined element of the completion $^\wedge D(U)$. Moreover, we have $pr = 0, rq = 0$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{i!} q^i r p^i = 1$ in $^\wedge D(U)$. It follows that $m = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{i!} q^i r p^i m$ for every $m \in M$. But this just says that $M = \mathbb{K}[[q]] \widehat{\otimes} r(M)$ and $r(M)$ coincides with the annihilator of p in M (and is naturally isomorphic to M/qM). ☐

Now let us show that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ restricts to an equivalence $\widehat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ The functor $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}$ is essentially just taking the tensor product with $\mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*]]$. All eigenvalues of θ on that module are non-negative integers. It follows that properties (1)-(3) in the definitions of the categories are equivalent for $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*]] \widehat{\otimes} \mathcal{N}$. This shows that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}$ is an equivalence between $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and $\widehat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

3.3.3. *Verma functor for* $\widehat{Wh}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ *and definition of* $\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Once again, we have a Verma functor $\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{U}} : \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_{\nu} \to \widehat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$:

$$\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathrm{Wh}}(\mathcal{N}^0) := {}^\wedge\mathcal{U} / {}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\, {}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{>0} \widehat{\otimes}_{{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0} \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0(\mathcal{N}^0).$$

Here $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0$ is the $\mathfrak{g}_0$-counterpart of the equivalence $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}$. It is straightforward to check that $\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ is indeed an object of $\widehat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$.

We define the full subcategory $\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu} \subset \widehat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$ as the Serre span of $\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$ with $\mathcal{N}^0 \in \mathcal{O}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_{\nu}$.

We claim that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}$ (and hence $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$) intertwines the functors $\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{W}}$. We have the following equality of modules over $^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{N}^0) =& [{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W}) / {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})\, {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})_{>0}] \widehat{\otimes}_{{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}^0(\mathcal{W}^0)} (\mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^{0*}]] \widehat{\otimes} \mathcal{N}^0) = \\ & \left({}^\wedge\mathbb{A} / {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}\, {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}_{>0} \widehat{\otimes}_{{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}^0} \mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^{0*}]]\right) \widehat{\otimes} \left({}^\wedge\mathcal{W} / {}^\wedge\mathcal{W}_{>0} \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{W}^0} \mathcal{N}^0\right) = \\ & \mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*]] \widehat{\otimes} \hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0).\end{aligned}$$

But this equality precisely means that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}(\hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0)) = \hat{\Delta}^{\theta}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{N}^0)$.

In particular, it follows that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ restricts to an equivalence of $\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$.

We remark that we do not know any direct equivalence between $\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$ and $\mathrm{Wh}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$.

3.3.4. *Equivariant versions.* Again, we can consider the equivariant versions $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_{\nu}, \hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_{\nu}$ of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}, \hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^{\theta}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\nu}$ and can upgrade $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ to an equivalence of these categories.

4. GENERALIZED SOERGEL FUNCTOR

4.1. **Functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$.**

4.1.1. *Category $\mathcal{O}_\nu^K$.* Recall that we have fixed an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $e,h,f\in\mathfrak{g}$. Next, pick a connected algebraic subgroup $K\subset G$ such that

- $U:=\mathfrak{k}\cap V$ is a lagrangian subspace in $V:=[\mathfrak{g},f]$.
- χ vanishes on $\mathfrak{k}$.

Let R denote a maximal reductive subgroup of the intersection $Q\cap K$.

Let us provide an example of this situation we are mostly dealing with in this paper.

Let $\theta,\mathfrak{g}=\bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathfrak{g}_i,\mathfrak{p}$ be as in 2.6.1. Then we set $K:=P$. Let us check that our conditions are satisfied. Clearly, χ vanishes on P and so it remains to prove that U is lagrangian. First, it is easy to see that ω_χ vanishes on $\mathfrak{k}$ and hence on $\mathfrak{k}\cap V$. Let us compute the dimension of $\mathfrak{k}\cap V$. We have $\mathfrak{k}\cap V=(\mathfrak{g}_0(\geqslant 0)\cap[\mathfrak{g}_0,f])\oplus[\mathfrak{g}_{>0},f]$. The first summand is isomorphic to $[\mathfrak{g}_0,f]/\mathfrak{g}_0(<0)$ and so its dimension is $\dim\mathfrak{g}_0(<0)=\frac{1}{2}\dim[\mathfrak{g}_0,f]$. The $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-modules $\mathfrak{g}_{>0}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{<0}$ are dual to each other and hence are isomorphic. So $\dim[\mathfrak{g}_{>0},f]=\frac{1}{2}(\dim[\mathfrak{g},f]-\dim[\mathfrak{g}_0,f])$. We get $\dim\mathfrak{k}\cap V=\frac{1}{2}\dim[\mathfrak{g},f]=\frac{1}{2}\dim V$.

Recall that in Subsection 2.6.1 we have introduced the anti-automorphism τ of $\mathfrak{g}$. We would like to point out that $\mathfrak{p}$ is not τ-stable.

Two other examples of K will be introduced in Section 6.

4.1.2. *Choice of $\iota:V\to\tilde{I}_\chi$.* Now we are going to prove that there is an embedding $\iota:V\hookrightarrow\tilde{I}_\chi$ with properties (2)-(3) from Subsection 2.1 such that the image of U lies in $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$.

Let us choose a basis in $\mathfrak{g}_\chi$ as follows. Let $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ be a basis of eigenvectors for $[h,\cdot]$ in U. Let $y_1,\ldots,y_k\in V$ be such that $x_1,\ldots,x_k,y_1,\ldots,y_k$ is a symplectic basis, i.e, for the symplectic form ω on V (given by $\omega(u,v)=\langle\chi,[u,v]\rangle$) we have $\omega(x_i,x_j)=\omega(y_i,y_j)=0,\omega(y_i,x_j)=\delta_{ij}$. Further, complete $x_1,\ldots,x_k,y_1,\ldots,y_k$ to a basis in $\mathfrak{g}$ with vectors $z_1,\ldots,z_m\in\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e)\cap\mathfrak{k},w_1,\ldots,w_{m'}\in\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e)$. So we have $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}^*]^{\wedge_\chi}=\mathbb{K}[[x_1,\ldots,x_n,y_1,\ldots,y_n,z_1,\ldots,z_m,w_1,\ldots,w_{m'}]]$ as an algebra and $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}=\mathbb{K}[[x_1,\ldots,x_n,y_1,\ldots,y_n,z_1,\ldots,z_m,w_1,\ldots,w_{m'},\hbar]]$ as a vector space.

What we want to do is to construct elements $\tilde{x}_i,\tilde{y}_i,\tilde{z}_j,\tilde{w}_k\in\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ with $i=1,\ldots,n,j=1,\ldots,m,k=1,\ldots,m'$ such that

- $\tilde{x}_i-x_i,\tilde{y}_i-y_i,\tilde{z}_j-z_j,\tilde{w}_k-w_k\in\tilde{I}_\chi^2$,
- $[\tilde{x}_i,\tilde{x}_{i'}]=[\tilde{y}_i,\tilde{y}_{i'}]=0,[\tilde{x}_i,\tilde{y}_{i'}]=\delta_{ii'}\hbar^2$, and the $\tilde{x}$'s and $\tilde{y}$'s commute with $\tilde{z}$'s and $\tilde{w}$'s.
- $\tilde{x}_i,\tilde{z}_j\in\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$.

Then we define ι by $\iota(x_i):=\tilde{x}_i,\iota(y_i):=\tilde{y}_i$.

Construct an element $\tilde{x}_1$ as follows. Set $a_1:=\frac{1}{\hbar^2}[y_1,x_1]-1$. Expand a_1 in the form $a_1=\sum_{i=0}^\infty f_ix_1^i$, where each f_i is a series in $x_2,\ldots,x_n,y_1,\ldots,y_n,z_1,\ldots,z_m,w_1,\ldots,w_{m'},\hbar$ (with the variables written in this order, although this does not really matter). We remark that $a_1\in\tilde{I}_\chi$ or, equivalently, f_1 has zero constant term. Set $x_1^{(1)}:=x_1-\int a_1dx_1$, where $\int a_1dx_1:=\sum_{i=0}^\infty\frac{1}{i+1}f_ix_1^{i+1}$. We remark that $\int a_1dx_1\in\tilde{I}_\chi^2$ and also that $\int a_1dx_1\in\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$. We have

$$\frac{1}{\hbar^2}[y_1,x_1^{(1)}]\cong 1+a_1-\sum_{i=0}^\infty\frac{1}{\hbar^2}[y_1,f_i]x_1^{i+1}-\sum_{i=0}^\infty f_i\frac{1}{(i+1)\hbar^2}[y_1,x_1^{i+1}].$$

Since the f_i's do not include x_1 as a factor, we see that $\frac{1}{\hbar^2}[y_1,f_i]\in\tilde{I}_\chi$. Also $1-\frac{1}{\hbar^2}[y_1,x_1]\in\tilde{I}_\chi$. So we see that $a_1^{(1)}:=\frac{1}{\hbar^2}[y_1,x_1^{(1)}]-1\in\tilde{I}_\chi^2$. Now we can do the same procedure for $x_1^{(1)}$ instead of x_1. We will get $a_1^{(1)}\in\tilde{I}_\chi^3,x_1^{(2)}:=x_1-\int a_1^{(1)}dx_1^{(1)}$, and $[y_1,x_1^{(2)}]-1\in\tilde{I}_\chi^3$. For $\tilde{x}_1$ we take the limit $\lim_{n\to+\infty}x_1^{(n)}$. This element commutes with y_1, is congruent to x_1 modulo $\tilde{I}_\chi^2$ and belongs to $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$.

Let us set $\tilde{y}_1 = y_1$. We remark that $\mathbb{K}[[\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{x}_1, \hbar]]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]} Z = \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$, where Z stands for the centralizer of $y_1, \tilde{x}_1$ in $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$, compare with the proof of Proposition 3.3.1 in [Lo2].

Now let us show that we can find $\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_j, \hat{w}_{j'}, i = 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, \ldots, m, j' = 1, \ldots, m'$ such that

(i) $y_1, \tilde{x}_1$ commutes with $\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_j, \hat{w}_{j'}$,
(ii) $\hat{x}_i - x_i, \hat{y}_i - y_i, \hat{z}_j - z_j, \hat{w}_{j'} - w_{j'} \in \tilde{I}_\chi^2$.
(iii) $\hat{x}_i, \hat{z}_j \in \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$ for all $i = 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, \ldots, m$.

As before, we can modify the elements $x_i, y_i, z_j, w_{j'}$, so that they commute with y_1 and (ii) and (iii) still hold for the modifications. Let us write $\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i$ etc. for these modified elements. Let us show how to produce $\hat{x}_2$ from $\bar{x}_2$ so that (i)-(iii) are satisfied for $\hat{x}_2$. The other elements are similar. Since $[y_1, \bar{x}_2] = 0$ we have $\bar{x}_2 = \sum_{i=0}^\infty y_1^i g_i$ with $g_i \in Z$. Since $\bar{x}_2 - x_2 \in \tilde{I}_\chi^2$, we see that $g_0 \in x_2 + \tilde{I}_\chi^2$, while $g_1 \in \tilde{I}_\chi$. We set $\hat{x}_2 := g_0$. Clearly, $[\tilde{x}_1, \hat{x}_2] = 0$. Since $y_1^i g_i \in \tilde{I}_\chi^2$, we see that $\hat{x}_2 - x_2 = (\hat{x}_2 - \bar{x}_2) + (\bar{x}_2 - x_2) \in \tilde{I}_\chi^2$. It remains to check that $\hat{x}_2 \in \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$. This will follow if we check that $y_1^i g_i \in \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$ for all i. First of all, let us point out that $\frac{1}{\hbar^2}[\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}, \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}] \subset \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$, which follows from the observation that $\mathfrak{k}$ is a subalgebra. Consider the operator $E := -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} y_1[\tilde{x}_1, \cdot]$. It preserves the centralizer of y_1 and also $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$ and sends an element of the form $\sum_{i=0}^\infty y_1^i g_i$ to $\sum_{i=0}^\infty i y_1^i g_i$. Also $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$ is closed in the $\tilde{I}_\chi$-adic topology, see [Lo2, Lemma 2.4.4] for a more general result. Since all elements $E^i \bar{x}_2$ are in $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$, we see that indeed $y_1^i g_i \in \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$ for any i.

So we have constructed the elements $\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_j, \hat{w}_{j'}$ satisfying (i)-(iii) above. Set $\tilde{y}_2 := \hat{y}_2$. Now we can produce $\tilde{x}_2$ from $\hat{x}_2$ from before, then modify the elements $\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i (i \geqslant 3), \hat{z}_j, \hat{w}_{j'}$ so that the new elements satisfy (i) with $y_1, \tilde{x}_1$ replaced with $\hat{y}_2, \tilde{x}_2$ as well as (ii),(iii). And so on. We finish with elements $\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i, \tilde{z}_j, \tilde{w}_k$ with required properties.

Let us discuss the equivariance with respect to group actions. The subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}$ is $R \times \mathbb{K}^\times$-stable. Averaging over $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times R \times \mathbb{K}^\times$ preserves the property that $\iota(U) \subset \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$. So an embedding ι can be made $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times R \times \mathbb{K}^\times$-stable. Also if $\mathfrak{k}$ is τ-stable, then ι can be made, in addition, τ-stable.

In the case of most interest for us, $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{p}$, the subalgebra is not τ-stable, unless $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$. However, in this case one can still choose ι to be τ-equivariant. Indeed, $\mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$ is τ-stable. Also recall that in this case we assume that R is contained in G_0. So averaging over $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{K}^\times \times R)$ preserves the property that $\iota(U \cap \mathfrak{g}_0) \subset \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$. On the other hand, since the averaged ι is still $[\theta, \cdot]$-equivariant, $\iota(V \cap \mathfrak{g}_{>0}) \subset \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{g}_{>0} \subset \mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$.

In general, it seems that we cannot make ι both $\widetilde{Q}$-equivariant and mapping U to $\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\mathfrak{k}$. However, we still have an action of $\widetilde{Q}$ on $\mathcal{W}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ that restricts to the $\widetilde{R} := \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times R \times \mathbb{K}^\times)$-action coming from the splitting. This is because any two $\widetilde{R}$-equivariant ι's differ by an automorphism of the form $\exp(\frac{1}{\hbar^2}\operatorname{ad}(a))$, where $\frac{1}{\hbar^2}a$ is a $\widetilde{R}$-invariant element and $a \in \tilde{I}_\chi^3$. The target category for $\bullet_\dagger$ is still $\mathrm{HC}^Q(\mathcal{W})$ because the transformation $\exp(\frac{1}{\hbar^2}\operatorname{ad}(a))$ acts on $\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ for any HC bimodule $\mathcal{M}$.

4.1.3. *Construction of* $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. Pick a module $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}_\nu^K$. We can choose a K-stable increasing exhaustive filtration $\mathrm{F}_0\mathcal{M} \subset \mathrm{F}_1\mathcal{M} \subset \ldots$ on $\mathcal{M}$ such that this filtration is compatible with the filtration on $\mathcal{U}$ and $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$ is a finitely generated $S(\mathfrak{g})$-module. In fact, since the filtration is K-stable, $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$ is a $S(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{k}) = \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{k}^\perp]$-module. Consider the Rees $\mathcal{U}_\hbar$-module $\mathcal{M}_\hbar := \bigoplus_{i=0}^\infty \mathrm{F}_i\mathcal{M}\hbar^i$.

The space $\mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]$ has a natural structure of a $\mathbb{A}_\hbar^{\wedge_0}$-module, $\mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]=\mathbb{A}_\hbar^{\wedge_0}/\mathbb{A}_\hbar^{\wedge_0}U$ (an element $u\in U$ acts by $\hbar^2\partial_u$).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}'_\hbar$ be the annihilator of U in $\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$. A natural homomorphism*

$$\mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{M}'_\hbar\to\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$$

is bijective.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.6 and to other related statements such as [Lo2, Proposition 3.3.1] but we provide a proof for reader's convenience.

The kernel of the homomorphism is an $\hbar$-saturated (meaning that the quotient is $\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]$-flat) $\mathbb{A}_\hbar(V)^{\wedge_0}$-submodule in $\mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{M}'_\hbar$. Any such submodule can be shown to intersect $\mathcal{M}'_\hbar$, compare to [**?**, Lemma 3.4.3]. It follows that the kernel is trivial. It remains to prove that the homomorphism is surjective.

Recall that, thanks to the choice of a filtration on $\mathcal{M}$, we have $\mathfrak{k}\mathcal{M}_\hbar\subset\hbar^2\mathcal{M}_\hbar$. It follows that $U\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}\subset\hbar^2\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$.

Choose a basis $x_1,\ldots,x_m$ in U and vectors $y_1,\ldots,y_m\in V$ such that $y_1,\ldots,y_m,x_1,\ldots,x_m$ form a Darboux basis of V. For each $i=1,\ldots,m$ and any $n\in\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ the sum $\rho_i(n):=\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty}\frac{(-1)^j}{j}y_i^j\frac{1}{\hbar^{2j}}x_i^jn$ converges. Moreover, this sum is annihilated by x_i. Also, by the construction, $n-n_0=y_in'$, where $n_0:=\rho_i(n)$, for some $n'\in\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$. We can repeat the same argument with n' and get a decomposition $n-n_0-y_in_1=y_i^2n''_0$. Repeating this procedure we represent n as the infinite sum $\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty}y_i^jn_j$ with $x_in_j=0$ for all j. The element n_j in this expression has to be given by $n_j=\rho_i(\frac{1}{j!\hbar^{2j}}x_i^jn)$. The operator ρ_i commutes with $x_{i'},y_{i'},\rho_{i'}$ for $i'\neq i$. So we can first decompose n into the sum of $\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty}y_1^jn_j$, then decompose each n_j into the sum $\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty}y_2^kn_{jk}$ as above. But now each n_{jk} is annihilated by both x_1,x_2. Proceeding in this way, we get a required decomposition of n. ☐

With this lemma, we can construct the functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ completely analogously to $\bullet_\dagger$. Namely, let $\mathcal{N}_\hbar$ denote the subspace of $\mathbb{K}^\times$-stable elements in $\mathcal{N}'_\hbar$. Again, similarly to [Lo2, Proposition 3.3.1], using the fact that $\mathcal{W}_\hbar$ is positively graded, one shows that $\mathcal{N}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}=\mathcal{N}'_\hbar$. Then we set $\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}:=\mathcal{N}_\hbar/(\hbar-1)$. This is a finitely generated $\mathcal{W}$-module that is (canonically) independent of the choice of a good filtration on $\mathcal{M}$ (compare with the proof of a similar claim for $\bullet_\dagger$ in [Lo2]).

The group R naturally acts on $M_{\dagger,e}$ and this action is rational. However, the differential of the R-action coincides with the action of $\mathfrak{r}\subset\mathcal{W}$ only up to a shift by $\nu+\delta_K$, where δ_K is half the character of K on $\bigwedge^{top}U^*$, compare with the end of 2.6.2, for the reason similar to that situation. In particular, when $K=P$, we have $\delta_P=\tau(\delta)$. This is because U and $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}$ are complimentary lagrangian subspaces in V.

We also can consider the right-handed analog $\mathcal{O}_\nu^{K,r}$ of $\mathcal{O}_\nu^K$ in the category of right $\mathcal{U}$-modules. A straightforward ramification of the construction above produces a functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}^r$ from $\mathcal{O}_\nu^{K,r}$ to the category of right $\mathcal{W}$-modules (with R-action).

4.1.4. *General properties of $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$.* It is straight-forward from the construction that the functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}:\mathcal{O}_\nu^K\to\mathcal{W}\text{-mod}_\nu^R$ is exact. Here $\mathcal{W}\text{-mod}_\nu^R$ is the category of finitely generated $\mathcal{W}$-modules that are R-equivariant after the shift of the $\mathfrak{r}$-action by $\nu+\delta_K$.

Further, for $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}^K_\nu$ and a Harish-Chandra bimodule X we have $X \otimes_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}^K_\nu$ and we have a natural isomorphism $(X \otimes_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{M})_{\dagger,e} \xrightarrow{\sim} X_\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$. This is proved by tracking the constructions of $\bullet_\dagger$ and $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. In particular, if $\overline{\mathbb{O}}$ is an irreducible component of $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{U}/\operatorname{Ann}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M}))$, then $\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$ is finite dimensional.

Next, since $\mathcal{W}$ is a filtered algebra with $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{W} = \mathbb{K}[S]$, one can define the associate variety $\mathrm{V}(N)$ of a finitely generated $\mathcal{W}$-module N, this will be a conical (with respect to the Kazhdan action) subvariety of S. We have $\mathrm{V}(M_{\dagger,e}) = \mathrm{V}(M) \cap S$.

Next, we claim that there is a functor $\bullet^{\dagger,e} : \mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R_\nu \to \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^K_\nu$ with the property that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{U}}(\bullet, \bullet^{\dagger,e}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{W},R}(\bullet_\dagger, \bullet)$. This functor is constructed similarly to the functor $\bullet^\dagger$ in [Lo2]. Namely, we pick $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R_\nu$. Choose some good filtration and form the Rees module $\mathcal{N}_\hbar$. Then set $\mathcal{M}'_\hbar := \mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{N}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$. Choose the maximal subspace $\mathcal{M}_\hbar$, where $\mathbb{K}^\times$ acts locally finitely and the action of $\mathfrak{k}$ shifted by ν (i.e., given by $(x,m) \mapsto \frac{1}{\hbar^2}xm - \langle \nu, x\rangle m$) integrates to a K-action. This subspace is $\mathfrak{g}$- and R-stable and hence we have two R-actions: one obtained by restricting the action from $\mathcal{M}'_\hbar$ and the other restricted from a K-action. Similarly to [Lo2, 3.3], the structure map $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{M}_\hbar \to \mathcal{M}_\hbar$ is R-equivariant for both actions and the restrictions of the two R-actions to R° coincide. We deduce that the difference of the two actions is an R/R°-action commuting with $\mathfrak{g}$. We set $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger,e} := \mathcal{M}_\hbar^{R/R^\circ}/(\hbar - 1)$. We remark that $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger,e}$ comes equipped with a filtration (induced from the grading on $\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{R/R^\circ}$) and this filtration is good on any finitely generated submodule of $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger,e}$. As in [Lo2, 3.4], $\bullet^{\dagger,e}$ is a functor and it satisfies the required "adjointness" property. Of course, if we know that $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger,e} \in \mathcal{O}^K_\nu$ for all $\mathcal{N}$, then $\bullet^{\dagger,e}$ is the right adjoint functor of $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$.

For a conical K-stable subvariety $Z \subset \mathfrak{k}^\perp$ we can form the full subcategory $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,Z} \subset \mathcal{O}^K_\nu$ consisting of all modules M with $\mathrm{V}(M) \subset Z$.

Till the end of the subsection we make an additional assumption. Namely, we assume that $\mathfrak{k}^\perp \cap \mathbb{O}$ has finitely many K-orbits. Set $Y := Ke$. This is an irreducible component of $\mathfrak{k}^\perp \cap \mathbb{O}$ and its dimension equals $\frac{1}{2}\dim V$.

Consider the subvariety $Z := \bigcup_{\mathbb{O}'} \mathbb{O}' \cap \mathfrak{k}^\perp$, where the union is taken over all nilpotent orbits $\mathbb{O}'$ such that $\mathbb{O} \not\subset \overline{\mathbb{O}'}$. We can form the subcategories $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,Z}, \mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,Z\cup Y} \subset \mathcal{O}^K_\nu$ and their quotient $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,Y}$. The subcategory $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,Z}$ is precisely the kernel of $\bullet_\dagger$, while $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,Z\cup Y}$ is the preimage of the category of finite dimensional representations. In particular, the functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ descends to a functor from $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,Y}$ to the category $\mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R_{\nu,fin}$ of finite dimensional ν-shifted R-equivariant $\mathcal{W}$-modules.

Now consider the special case when $\operatorname{codim}_{\overline{Y}}(\partial Y) > 1$. We can restrict $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ to the subcategory $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,\overline{Y}}$. Then we can show analogously to [Lo2] that $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger,e}$ lies in $\mathcal{O}^K_{\nu,\overline{Y}}$ for any $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R_{\nu,fin}$.

Also under the assumption that $\operatorname{codim}_{\overline{Y}}(\partial Y) > 1$ we have an analog of [Lo2, Theorem 4.1.1]. Namely, pick $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}^K$ and let $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$ be an R-stable submodule of finite codimension. Then there is a unique maximal submodule $\mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{M}'_{\dagger,e} = \mathcal{N}$. Moreover, the quotient $\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}'$ lies in $\mathcal{O}^K_{\overline{Y}}$. The module $\mathcal{M}'$ coincides with the preimage of $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger,e} \subset (\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e})^{\dagger,e}$ under the adjunction morphism $\mathcal{M} \to (\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e})^{\dagger,e}$. The proof repeats that of [Lo2, Theorem 4.1.1].

We remark however that sometimes the codimension condition is not necessary: for $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ the conclusions of the two previous paragraphs are still true, as we will see in Subsection 4.3.

4.2. **Functor $\mathbb{V}$.**

4.2.1. *Three definitions.* Our goal is to define a functor $\mathbb{V}:\mathcal{O}^P_\nu\rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$. We start by giving three different definitions. Below in this subsection we will see that all three functors are isomorphic.

We claim that $\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}\in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)_\nu$ for $\mathcal{M}\in \mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. By the construction, the action of $\mathfrak{r}\subset R$ integrates to R after the $\nu+\delta$-shift. The other claims that we need to check (that the weight spaces are finite dimensional and are bounded by above) will follow if we show that the one parametric subgroup $\mathbb{K}^\times\rightarrow Q$ with differential θ contracts $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e})$ to e. But $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e})=\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{M})\cap S$. Since $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{M})\subset \mathfrak{p}^\perp$ and $\mathfrak{p}^\perp=(\mathfrak{g}_0\cap\mathfrak{p}^\perp)\oplus\mathfrak{g}_{>0}$ we only need to check that $(\mathfrak{g}_0\cap\mathfrak{p}^\perp)\cap(e+\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}_0}(f))=\{e\}$. But $\mathfrak{g}_0\cap\mathfrak{p}^\perp=\mathfrak{g}_0(>0)$ and $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}_0}(f)\subset\mathfrak{g}_0(<0)$ so our claim follows.

Let us now define $\mathbb{V}_2$. Pick $\mathcal{M}\in\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. Set $\mathcal{M}^\wedge:=\varprojlim_n \mathcal{M}/\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_\chi^n\mathcal{M}$. We claim that $\mathcal{M}^\wedge=\prod_\mu \mathcal{M}_\mu^{\wedge_0}$, where $\bullet^{\wedge_0}$ is the analog of $\bullet^\wedge$ for $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Indeed, $\prod_\mu\mathcal{M}_\mu^{\wedge_0}$ is complete and separated in the $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_\chi$-adic topology and contains $\mathcal{M}$ as a dense submodule.

So $\mathcal{M}^\wedge$ is an object in $\widehat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$. So $\hat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{M}^\wedge)_{fin}\in\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$. We set $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}):=\hat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{M}^\wedge)_{fin}$ so that $\mathbb{V}_2$ is a functor $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu\rightarrow\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$. Below we will see that the image is actually in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$.

Finally, let us define a functor $\mathbb{V}_3$. Again, pick $\mathcal{M}\in\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ and consider the completion $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$. This is an object in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^P_\nu$. Then we twist the $\mathfrak{g}$-action on $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\mathrm{Ad}(n^{-1})$, we get an object ${}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{n^{-1}Pn}_\nu$. The nil-radical of the parabolic subgroup $n^{-1}Pn$ coincides with $\mathfrak{m}$. For a module $\mathcal{M}'\in\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{n^{-1}Pn}_\nu$ we let $\mathrm{Wh}(\mathcal{M}')$ be the subspace in $\mathcal{M}'$ spanned by all $\mathfrak{t}$-weight vectors that are nilpotent for the action of $\mathfrak{m}^0_\chi$ (and automatically nilpotent for $\mathfrak{g}_{>0}$). Hence $\mathrm{Wh}(\mathcal{M}')\in\tilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$. So $\mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M}):=\mathcal{K}(\mathrm{Wh}({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}))$ is an object of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$.

Below in this subsection we will prove that the three functors $\mathbb{V}_i$ are isomorphic. The scheme of a proof is as follows. First, we show that $\mathbb{V}_1\cong\mathbb{V}_2$, this is quite easy. After that, it remains to prove that $\mathbb{V}_2\cong\mathbb{V}_3$. We start proving this by showing that $\mathbb{V}_3$ is dual to $\mathbb{V}_2$, i.e. $\mathbb{V}_3(\bullet)=\mathbb{V}_2(\bullet^\vee)^\vee$. Next, we show that $\mathbb{V}_i(X\otimes_{\mathcal{U}}\mathcal{M})=X_\dagger\otimes_{\mathcal{W}}\mathbb{V}_i(\mathcal{M})$ for all i (a bi-functorial isomorphism). After that, we show that the functors $\mathbb{V}_i$ basically intertwine the Verma module functors. Finally, we use the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence to establish an isomorphism $\mathbb{V}_2\cong\mathbb{V}_3$.

4.2.2. *Isomorphism of* $\mathbb{V}_1$ *and* $\mathbb{V}_2$. Recall that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ is defined as follows. We use the identification ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\cong{}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$ to view $\mathcal{M}^\wedge={}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\otimes_{\mathcal{U}}\mathcal{M}$ as a module over ${}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$. This module is isomorphic to $\mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*]]\widehat{\otimes}\mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is a ${}^\wedge\mathcal{W}$-module. Taking θ-finite elements in $\mathcal{N}$, we get $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M})$. Recall that by $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*$ we mean any lagrangian subspace in V complimentary to $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}$, in particular, we can take $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*=U$.

On the other hand, we can define $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ on the dehomogenized level (we still need to fix a good filtration on $\mathcal{M}$). Namely, we can set $\mathcal{M}^\heartsuit:=\mathcal{U}^\heartsuit\otimes_{\mathcal{U}}\mathcal{M}$. Alternatively, $\mathcal{M}^\heartsuit=(\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi})_{\mathbb{K}^\times-fin}/(\hbar-1)$. The algebra $\mathcal{U}^\heartsuit$ is naturally included into ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U}$ and we have $\mathcal{M}^\wedge={}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\otimes_{\mathcal{U}^\heartsuit}\mathcal{M}^\heartsuit$. On the other hand, applying the $\heartsuit$-construction to the decomposition $\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}=\mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{N}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$, we get $\mathcal{M}^\heartsuit=\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\heartsuit\otimes_{\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})}(\mathbb{K}[U]\otimes\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e})$. The module $\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$ can be recovered by factoring out $\bar{\mathfrak{v}}$ and then take θ-finite vectors (in fact, the latter is not necessary). We get

$$\mathcal{M}^\wedge={}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})\otimes_{\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\heartsuit}\mathcal{M}^\heartsuit={}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})\otimes_{\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})}(S(\bar{\mathfrak{v}})\otimes\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e})=\mathbb{K}[[\bar{\mathfrak{v}}^*]]\widehat{\otimes}\widehat{\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}}.$$

So $\mathcal{N}=\widehat{\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}}$ and hence $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M})=\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$. Tracking the construction, we see that it is functorial.

It remains to prove that $\mathbb{V}_3 \cong \mathbb{V}_2$. The proof will occupy the rest of the subsection, its various parts will also be used later.

4.2.3. $\mathbb{V}_2, \mathbb{V}_3$ *and duality.* Here we are going to show that $\mathbb{V}_2(\bullet^\vee)^\vee \cong \mathbb{V}_3(\bullet)$. In particular, this will imply that $\mathbb{V}_3$ is exact and its image is in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_\nu$.

We are going to show that there is a natural non-degenerate pairing between $\mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}^\vee)$. As we have seen, Lemma 3.4, this implies the existence of a functorial isomorphism $\mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}^\vee)^\vee$.

Recall that we have a σ-contravariant pairing $\mathcal{M}^\vee \times \widehat{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathbb{K}$. It can be regarded a τ-contravariant pairing $\mathcal{M}^\vee \times {}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ that identifies ${}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ with the full dual of $\mathcal{M}^\vee$. It follows that there is a τ-contravariant pairing

$$(\mathcal{M}^\vee)^\wedge \times \mathrm{Wh}({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}) \to \mathbb{K} \tag{4.1}$$

that identifies $\mathrm{Wh}({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}})$ with the continuous dual of $(\mathcal{M}^\vee)^\wedge$. Recall that the identifications ${}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \cong {}^\wedge\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\mathcal{U}^\wedge \cong \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{W})^\wedge$ are obtained from one another by a τ-twist. So (4.1) gives rise to a non-degenerate (in the sense that both left and right kernels are zero) contravariant pairing between $(\mathcal{M}^\vee)^\wedge/\bar{\mathfrak{v}}(\mathcal{M}^\vee)^\wedge$ and $\mathrm{Wh}({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}})^{\mathfrak{v}}$. The latter module is $\mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M})$. The former module is $\widehat{\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}^\vee)}$. So we get a natural non-degenerate contravariant pairing between $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}^\vee)$ and $\mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M})$. An isomorphism $\mathbb{V}_3 \cong \mathbb{V}_2(\bullet^\vee)^\vee$ is therefore proved.

4.2.4. *Products with Harish-Chandra bimodules.* We claim that all three functors $\mathbb{V}_i$ satisfy $\mathbb{V}_i(X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M}) = X_\dagger \otimes_\mathcal{W} \mathbb{V}_i(\mathcal{M})$ (functorially in X and $\mathcal{M}$), where X is a Harish-Chandra bimodule. We have already established this property for $\mathbb{V}_1$. For $\mathbb{V}_2$, the property follows from the already proved isomorphism $\mathbb{V}_1 \cong \mathbb{V}_2$. So it remains to prove the functorial isomorphism for $\mathbb{V}_3$.

First of all, we claim that there is a natural transformation $X_\dagger \otimes_\mathcal{W} \mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathbb{V}_3(X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M})$. There is a natural homomorphism $X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \widehat{\mathcal{M}} \to \widehat{X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M}}$ extending $X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M} \to \widehat{X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M}}$. It is again easy to see a natural transformation $X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathrm{Wh}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}) \to \mathrm{Wh}(X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \widehat{\mathcal{M}})$. But according to [LO, Theorem 5.11], $\mathcal{K}(X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M}_1) = X_\dagger \otimes_\mathcal{W} \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ for any $\mathcal{M}_1 \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$ and this isomorphism is bifunctorial. So we get a natural transformation of interest.

Above we have already proved that $\mathbb{V}_3$ is exact. Thanks to the 5-lemma, it is enough to show that the natural transformation is an isomorphism for $X = L \otimes \mathcal{U}$, where L is a finite dimensional G-module (here $\mathfrak{g}$ acts on the right in a naive way, while the left action is given by $x(l \otimes m) = x.l \otimes m + l \otimes xm$). It is clear that $\widehat{L \otimes \mathcal{M}} = L \otimes \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$. Thanks to [LO, Theorem 5.11], it is enough to show that taking the tensor product with L commutes with taking Wh. This easily reduces to the claim that the conditions for $x \in L \otimes \mathcal{M}_1$ to lie in a finite dimensional submodule are equivalent for the following actions:

- the diagonal $\mathfrak{g}$-action,
- the $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$-action,
- the $\mathfrak{g}$-action on the second factor.

This observation is a formal corollary of $\dim L < \infty$. Here $\mathcal{M}_1$ is an arbitrary $\mathfrak{g}$-module.

So we have proved that $X_\dagger \otimes_\mathcal{W} \mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{V}_3(X \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M})$.

4.2.5. *Images of induced modules.* Let $\mathbb{V}^0_i$ be the functor defined analogously to $\mathbb{V}_i$ for $\mathfrak{g}_0$, where $i = 2, 3$. Consider the parabolic category $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$ for $(\mathfrak{g}_0, P_0 := P \cap G_0)$. We have the induction functor $\Delta^0 : \mathcal{U}^0\text{-Mod} \to \mathcal{U}\text{-Mod}, \Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0) := \mathcal{U} \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}_{\geqslant 0})} \mathcal{M}^0$ that maps $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$ to $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$.

Our goal now is to show that the functors $\mathbb{V}_i(\Delta^0(\bullet)), \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_i(\bullet)) : \mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu \to \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_\nu$ are isomorphic. This boils down to checking an isomorphism of bifunctors

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}_i(\Delta^0(\bullet)), ?) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\Delta^\theta(\mathbb{V}^0_i(\bullet)), ?).$$

Consider the case $i = 2$ first. We have $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}) = \hat{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{M}^\wedge)_{fin}$. Both $\bullet_{fin}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ are category equivalences. So, for $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}^P_\nu, \mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)_\nu$, we have a bifunctorial isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{N}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\mathcal{M}^\wedge, \hat{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{N}})). \tag{4.2}$$

Clearly, $\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0)^\wedge = {}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \otimes_{\mathcal{U}} \Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0) = {}^\wedge\mathcal{U} \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}_{\geqslant 0})} \mathcal{M}^0 = [{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}/{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}\,{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}_{>0}]\widehat{\otimes}_{{}^\wedge\mathcal{U}^0}\mathcal{M}^{0\wedge_0} = \hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{M}^0))$. Recall that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ intertwines the functors $\hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}, \hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$, while $\bullet_{fin}$ intertwines $\hat{\Delta}^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$. So

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0)^\wedge, \hat{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}(\mathcal{N})) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{M}^0)), \mathcal{N}). \tag{4.3}$$

Combining (4.2) and (4.3), we see that $\mathbb{V}_2(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0)) = \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{M}^0))$.

Let us proceed to $\mathbb{V}_3$. We are going to use a similar argument. We have

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R}(\mathbb{V}_3(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{N}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathrm{Wh}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R}(\mathrm{Wh}({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}), \mathcal{K}^{-1}(\mathcal{N})). \tag{4.4}$$

We have a natural map

$$\Delta^0(\mathrm{Wh}_0({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}^0})) \to \mathrm{Wh}(\widehat{\Delta^0({}^{n^{-1}}\mathcal{M}^0)}) \tag{4.5}$$

induced by a natural inclusion $\mathrm{Wh}_0({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_0) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Wh}(\widehat{\Delta^0({}^{n^{-1}}\mathcal{M}^0)})$. Assume for a moment that (4.5) is an isomorphism. The functors $\mathcal{M}^0 \mapsto {}^{n^{-1}}\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0), \Delta^0({}^{n^{-1}}\mathcal{M}^0)$ are isomorphic via $a \otimes m \mapsto \mathrm{Ad}(n)a \otimes m$. As in the case of $\mathbb{V}_2$, $\Delta^0(\mathrm{Wh}_0({}^{n^{-1}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}^0})) = \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{V}^0_3(\mathcal{M}^0))$ and, combining (4.4) with our assumption on (4.5), we see that

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R}(\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M})), \mathcal{N}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R}(\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_3(\mathcal{M}^0)), \mathcal{N}).$$

Hence $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M})) = \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_3(\mathcal{M}^0))$.

So it remains to show that (4.5) is an isomorphism.

The composition of (4.5) with the inclusion $\mathrm{Wh}(\widehat{\Delta^0({}^{n^{-1}}\mathcal{M}^0)}) \subset \widehat{\Delta^0({}^{n^{-1}}\mathcal{M}^0)}$ is injective because the functor Δ^0 is exact. So (4.5) is injective.

To show that (4.5) is an isomorphism it is enough to check that the characters of the images of both modules under $\mathcal{K}$ are the same. The argument above shows that the coincidence of characters is equivalent to saying that the characters of $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0))$ and $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_3(\mathcal{M}^0))$ are the same. Since both functors $\mathbb{V}_3 \circ \Delta^0, \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}} \circ \mathbb{V}^0_3$ are exact it is enough to consider the case when $\mathcal{M}^0$ is simple. Recall that $\mathbb{V}_3(\bullet) = \mathbb{V}_2(\bullet^\vee)^\vee$. So $\mathbb{V}_3 \circ \Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0) = \mathbb{V}_2(\nabla^0(\mathcal{M}^0))^\vee$, where $\nabla^0(\bullet) := \Delta^0(\bullet)^\vee$. The classes of $\nabla^0(\mathcal{M}^0), \Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0)$ in the Grothendieck group of $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ coincide. Since $\mathbb{V}_2$ is exact, the characters of $\mathbb{V}_2 \circ \nabla^0(\mathcal{M}^0)$ and of $\mathbb{V}_2 \circ \Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0)$ coincide. Also the duality $\bullet^\vee$ for the W-algebra does not change the character, see 3.2.6. We see that the characters of $\mathbb{V}_2(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0))$ and of $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0))$ are the same. Now we claim that the characters of $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{M}^0)), \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0_3(\mathcal{M}^0))$ are the same, this will finish the proof. To show the coincidence of those characters one needs to show that $\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{M}^0), \mathbb{V}^0_3(\mathcal{M}^0)$ are isomorphic as $\mathfrak{t}$-modules. This again follows from $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M}^{0\vee_0})^{\vee_0} \cong \mathbb{V}^0_3(\mathcal{M}^0)$. Indeed, by construction, $\bullet^{\vee_0}$ does not change the $\mathfrak{t}$-module structure.

4.2.6. *Isomorphism of* $\mathbb{V}_2$ *and* $\mathbb{V}_3$. First, we will show that the images of a certain parabolic Verma module under $\mathbb{V}_2$ and $\mathbb{V}_3$ are isomorphic. Then we will use 4.2.4 and the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence recall in 3.1.5 to show that $\mathbb{V}_2 \cong \mathbb{V}_3$.

The parabolic Verma module we are going to consider is $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$. Recall that $\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ denotes its annihilator in $\mathcal{U}$.

Clearly, $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho) = \Delta^0(\Delta_{P_0}(\nu+\rho))$. Thanks to 4.2.5, it is enough to show that $\mathbb{V}_2^0(\Delta_{P_0}(\nu+\rho)) \cong \mathbb{V}_3^0(\Delta_{P_0}(\nu+\rho))$. So it is enough to assume that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$.

In this case, the dimension of $\mathbb{V}_2(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)) = \mathbb{V}_1(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho))$ equals to the multiplicity of $\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)$ on Pe, the dense orbit of P in $\mathfrak{p}^\perp$. As we have recalled in 3.1.5, this multiplicity equals 1. Since the duality does not change the multiplicity, 4.2.3 implies that $\dim \mathbb{V}_3(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)) = 1$.

So to show the isomorphism it remains to prove that the annihilators of both modules coincide. The ideal $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$ coincides with the kernel of the epimorphism $\mathcal{U} \to D_\nu(G/P)$, where the target algebra is the algebra of ν-twisted differential operators on G/P. So it is prime (and even completely prime) and hence primitive, and $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}) = \overline{\mathbb{O}}$. Moreover, the element e is even and hence the morphism $T^*(G/P) \twoheadrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{O}}$ is birational. It follows that the multiplicity of $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J} = D_\nu(G/P)$ on $\mathbb{O}$ is 1. So $\mathcal{J}_\dagger$ is an ideal of codimension 1 in $\mathcal{W}$. It annihilates $\mathbb{V}_2(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho))$ because of the isomorphism $\mathbb{V}_1 \cong \mathbb{V}_2$. Let us show that $\mathcal{J}_\dagger$ annihilates $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho))$. We recall that $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)) = \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{Wh}({}^{n^{-1}}\hat{\Delta}_P(\nu+\rho)))$. The ideal $\mathcal{J}$ annihilates ${}^{n^{-1}}\hat{\Delta}_P(\nu+\rho)$ and hence $\mathrm{Wh}({}^{n^{-1}}\hat{\Delta}_P(\nu+\rho))$. Thanks to [LO, Theorem 5.11], $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)) = \mathcal{K}(\mathrm{Wh}({}^{n}\hat{\Delta}_P(\nu+\rho)))$ is annihilated by $\mathcal{J}_\dagger$.

The proof of the isomorphism $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)) \cong \mathbb{V}_2(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho))$ is now complete (for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$ and hence for general $\mathfrak{g}$, as well).

Now we are ready to complete the proof of an isomorphism $\mathbb{V}_2 \cong \mathbb{V}_3$. Recall the parabolic Bernstein- Gelfand equivalence $X \mapsto X \otimes_{\mathcal{U}} \Delta_P(\nu+\rho) : \mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}} \to \mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. Under the identification of $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ with $\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}}$, thanks to 4.2.4, we have $\mathbb{V}_i(X) = X_\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{W}} \mathbb{V}_i(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho))$. Since $\mathbb{V}_3(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho)) \cong \mathbb{V}_2(\Delta_P(\nu+\rho))$, we are finally done.

From now on, all three isomorphic functors will be denoted by $\mathbb{V}$.

4.3. **Further properties of** $\mathbb{V}$**.** Here we will show that $\mathbb{V}$ is a quotient onto its image and identify the modules annihilated by $\mathbb{V}$. The next important property we are going to prove is that $\mathbb{V}$ satisfies the double centralizer property, i.e., is fully faithful on projective objects. Then we are going to establish a sufficient condition for $\mathbb{V}$ to be fully faithful on standardly (=Verma) filtered objects. Finally, we summarize the properties we have proved in Theorem 4.6.

4.3.1. *Quotient property.*

Proposition 4.2. *The functor* $\mathbb{V} : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu \to \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_\nu$ *is a quotient functor onto its image. The image is closed under taking subquotients. The modules killed by* $\mathbb{V}$ *are precisely those whose all weight spaces for* $\mathfrak{t}$ *have GK dimension less then* $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 - \dim \mathfrak{g}_0(\geqslant 0)$ *(the maximal GK dimension of a module in* $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$*).*

Proof. First, let us consider the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$.

Recall the identification $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu \cong \mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\mathcal{J}}$, where we set $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_{P,\nu}$, and that under this identification the functor $\mathbb{V}$ becomes $X \mapsto X_\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is a unique 1-dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-module annihilated by $\mathcal{J}_\dagger$. The functor $Y \mapsto Y \otimes_{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{N}$ is an equivalence between the category $\mathrm{HC}^Q_{fin}(\mathcal{W})^{\mathcal{J}_\dagger}$ annihilated by $\mathcal{J}_\dagger$ from the right and the category of Q-equivariant finite dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-modules. So $\mathbb{V}$ becomes just the restriction of $\bullet_\dagger$ to $\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\mathcal{J}}\to\mathrm{HC}^Q_{fin}(\mathcal{W})^{\mathcal{J}_\dagger}$ and now our claim follows from the properties of $\bullet_\dagger$.

For the future use we remark that the functor $\bullet^\dagger$ maps $\mathrm{HC}^Q_{fin}(\mathcal{W})^{\mathcal{J}_\dagger}$ to $\mathrm{HC}(\mathcal{U})^{\mathcal{J}}$. This is because $\mathcal{J}=(\mathcal{J}_\dagger)^\dagger$ (the equality follows from $\mathcal{J}$ being primitive, $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J})=\overline{\mathbb{O}}$, and results recalled in Subsection 2.2) and so if $\mathcal{N}$ is annihilated by $\mathcal{J}_\dagger$, then, by the construction of $\bullet^\dagger$, $\mathcal{N}^\dagger$ is annihilated by $(\mathcal{J}_\dagger)^\dagger$. So $\mathbb{V}$ possesses a right adjoint functor.

Now proceed to the case of a general θ. It is enough to prove that the functor $\mathcal{F}:\mathcal{M}\mapsto\mathcal{M}^\wedge:\mathcal{O}^P_\nu\to\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$ is a quotient onto its image. As we have noted in 4.2.1, $\mathcal{M}^\wedge=\prod_{\mu\in\mathfrak{t}^*}\mathcal{M}_\mu^{\wedge_0}$, where $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is the μ-weight space for the action of $\mathfrak{t}$. The claim about the objects annihilated by $\mathcal{F}$ follows now from the properties of $\mathbb{V}^0$ (an object in $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$ is annhilated by $\mathbb{V}^0_1$ if and only if its support does not contain e; this is equivalent to the condition on the GK dimension).

We claim that there is a right adjoint functor $\mathcal{G}$ for $\mathcal{F}$. First recall that the functor $\mathcal{M}^0\mapsto\mathcal{M}^{0\wedge_0}$ has a right adjoint functor because it becomes $\mathbb{V}^0$ under a suitable category equivalence. The right adjoint functor is realized as follows. For $\mathcal{N}^0\in\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)^R$ let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0(\mathcal{N}^0)$ be the sum of all submodules of $\mathcal{N}^0$ belonging to $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$. Similarly to 4.1.4, on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0(\mathcal{N}^0)$ we have two R-actions, one restricted from $\mathcal{N}^0$ and one coming from the P_0-action. They agree on R° and their difference is an R/R°-action commuting with $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_0(\mathcal{N}^0)$ denote the subspace of R/R°-invariants in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0(\mathcal{N}^0)$.

Now take $\mathcal{N}\in\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$. Then its weight subspaces $\mathcal{N}_\mu$ are objects of $\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0,e)^R_\nu$. Clearly, $\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{N}_\mu\subset\mathcal{N}$ is $\mathfrak{g}$-stable. Further, it is easy to see that $\bigoplus_\mu\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule. The action map $\mathfrak{g}\times\bigoplus_\mu\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0(\mathcal{N}_\mu)\to\bigoplus_\mu\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ is equivariant with respect to both R-actions. So $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N}):=\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{G}_0(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule in $\mathcal{N}$. It follows easily from the construction that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M}^\wedge,\mathcal{N})=\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N}))$. Since all $\mathcal{U}^0$-modules $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N})_\mu=\mathcal{G}_0(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ are in $\mathcal{O}^P_0$ (because $\mathcal{G}_0$ is right adjoint to $\mathbb{V}^0$), all $\mathfrak{h}$-weight spaces in $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N})$ are finite dimensional and so $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N})\in\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. So $\mathcal{G}$ is a right adjoint functor for $\mathbb{V}_2$.

Let us show that the kernel and the cokernel of the adjunction homomorphism $\mathcal{M}\to\mathcal{G}\circ\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{M})$ lie in the kernel of $\mathbb{V}$. But this homomorphism has the form $\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{M}_\mu\to\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{M}_\mu))$, where the maps $\mathcal{M}_\mu\to\mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{M}_\mu))$ are the adjunction maps. Our claim follows.

Let us prove that the image of $\mathbb{V}_2$ is closed under taking taking subquotients (equivalently, taking subobjects). Namely, let us take a subobject $\mathcal{N}'\subset\mathcal{N}$ (in the category $\hat{\mathrm{Wh}}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu$). It has the form $\prod_{\mu\in\mathfrak{t}^*}\mathcal{N}'_\mu$. So $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N}')=\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{G}_0(\mathcal{N}'_\mu)$ and $\mathbb{V}_2(\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N}'))=\prod_\mu\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{G}_0(\mathcal{N}'_\mu))$. But $\mathbb{V}^0_2(\mathcal{G}_0(\mathcal{N}'_\mu))=\mathcal{N}'_\mu$ by the already established properties of $\mathbb{V}^0_2$. $\square$

4.3.2. $\mathbb{V}$ *vs homological duality.* Recall that we have a derived equivalence $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}:D^b(\mathcal{O}^P_\nu)\to D^b(\mathcal{O}^{P,r})^{opp}$, where $\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu$ denotes the analog of $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ for right modules, given by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\bullet):=\mathrm{RHom}(\bullet,\mathcal{U})[\dim\mathfrak{g}-\dim\mathfrak{p}],$$

compare with [GGOR, Section 4.1].

Clearly, if $\mathcal{N}$ is a finitely generated R-equivariant left $\mathcal{W}$-module, then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N},\mathcal{W})$ is also finitely generated and R-equivariant (as a right $\mathcal{W}$-module). Therefore we can form a similar functor for the W-algebra, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}:D^b(\mathcal{W}-\mathrm{mod}^R_\nu)\to D^b(\mathcal{W}^{opp}-\mathrm{mod}^R_\nu)^{opp},\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}(\bullet)=\mathrm{RHom}(\bullet,\mathcal{W})[\dim\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e)-\dim\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e)_{\geqslant 0}]$.

We can define the analog of $\mathbb{V}_1(\bullet) = \bullet_{\dagger,e}$ for the categories of right modules completely analogously to the above, see 4.1.3. This functor will be denoted by $\mathbb{V}^r$.

Then we have the following statement.

Proposition 4.3. *The functors* $\mathbb{V}^r(H_i(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\bullet))) \cong H_i(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}(\bullet))) : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu \to (\mathcal{W}^{opp} - \operatorname{mod}^R_\nu)^{opp}$ *are isomorphic.*

In fact, the functors $\mathbb{V}^r(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\bullet))$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}(\bullet))$ should be isomorphic but we do not want to provide a careful proof of this because we will not need this fact.

Proof. Pick $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ and fix a good filtration of $\mathcal{M}$. Then we can pick a graded free resolution $\ldots \to A^1 \to A^0 \to \operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$ and lift it to a free resolution $\ldots \to \mathcal{A}^1 \to \mathcal{A}^0 \to \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^i$ is the sum of several copies of $\mathcal{U}$ each equipped with a shift of the PBW filtration and all differentials are strictly compatible with filtrations. Then we get a graded resolution $\ldots \mathcal{A}^1_\hbar \to \mathcal{A}^0_\hbar \to \mathcal{M}_\hbar$. Let us tensor the resolution with $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar$. Since $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar$ is a flat $\mathcal{U}_\hbar$-module, see [Lo2], we get a resolution of $\mathcal{M}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar$:

$$\ldots \mathcal{A}^{1\wedge_\chi}_\hbar \to \mathcal{A}^{0\wedge_\chi}_\hbar \to \mathcal{M}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar.$$

There is also another way to obtained a free resolution of $\mathcal{M}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar = \mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{N}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar$, where $\mathcal{N}_\hbar$ is the Rees module of $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M})$ (with the filtration induced from $\mathcal{M}$). So we can take a free resolution $\ldots \to \underline{\mathcal{A}}^0 \to \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M})$, lift it to a graded free resolution: $\ldots \to \underline{\mathcal{A}}^0_\hbar \to \mathcal{N}_\hbar$ and then complete at χ. Also we can take the Koszul resolution for the $\mathbb{A}^{\wedge_0}_\hbar$-module $\mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]] = \mathbb{A}^{\wedge_0}_\hbar/\mathbb{A}^{\wedge_0}_\hbar U$. This resolution is obtained by taking the Koszul resolution $\ldots \to \mathbb{K}[U]\otimes\bigwedge^i U \to \mathbb{K}[U]\otimes\bigwedge^{i-1} U \to \ldots$ of $\mathbb{K}[U]/(U)$ and applying the functor $\mathbb{A}^{\wedge_0}_\hbar \otimes_{\mathbb{K}[U]} \bullet$ to it. Multiplying the resolutions of $\mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]$ and $\mathcal{N}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar$, we get another resolution of $\mathcal{M}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar = \mathbb{K}[[U,\hbar]]\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{K}[[\hbar]]}\mathcal{N}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar$.

We are going to show that the homology of the dual of the first resolution produces $H_i(\mathbb{V}^r(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M})))$ (in the same way as was used in 4.1.3 to pass from $\mathcal{U}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar$-modules to $\mathcal{W}$-modules: we need to, first, factor out $\mathbb{K}[U][[\hbar]]$, then take $\mathbb{K}^\times$-finite elements, and then mod out $\hbar - 1$), while the cohomology similarly produce $H_i(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M})))$.

Consider the resolution $\to \mathcal{A}^2_\hbar \xrightarrow{d_1} \mathcal{A}^1_\hbar \xrightarrow{d_0} \mathcal{A}^0_\hbar$. The complex

$$\mathcal{A}^0_\hbar \xrightarrow{d_0^*} \mathcal{A}^1_\hbar \xrightarrow{d_1^*} \mathcal{A}^2_\hbar \ldots \tag{4.6}$$

of right modules computes $\operatorname{RHom}(\mathcal{M}_\hbar, \mathcal{U}_\hbar)$. The complex $\mathcal{A}^{0\wedge_\chi}_\hbar \xrightarrow{d_0^*} \mathcal{A}^{1\wedge_\chi} \xrightarrow{d_2^*} \mathcal{A}^{2\wedge_\chi}_\hbar \ldots$ computes $\operatorname{RHom}(\mathcal{M}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar, \mathcal{U}^{\wedge_\chi}_\hbar)$. Its cohomology are obtained by completing the cohomology of (4.6). This means that the cohomology of $\mathbb{V}^r(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M}))$ are obtained from the first resolution in the way explained in the previous paragraph. The proof for the second resolution is similar.

The isomorphisms of the two H^i's we have constructed do not depend on the choice of a filtration on $\mathcal{M}$ for the same reason as for $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ to be a functor. Also the construction is functorial in $\mathcal{M}$ for the standard homological algebra reasons. □

4.3.3. *Double centralizer property.* Our goal here is to prove the double centralizer property: that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^P_\nu}(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P}_1), \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P}_2))$ for any projective objects $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in \mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. Our proof closely follows that from [GGOR].

The socle of $\Delta_P(\lambda)$ has maximal GK dimension and hence is not annihilated by $\mathbb{V} = \bullet_{\dagger,e}$. It follows that the natural homomorphism $\mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{V}^*(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}))$ is injective for any standardly filtered (=admitting a filtration such that the subsequent quotients are parabolic Verma modules) module $\mathcal{M}$. Similarly, a costandard object (=dual Verma) has no simple quotients annihilated by $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. Since the quotient $\mathbb{V}^*(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}))/\mathcal{M}$ is annihilated by $\mathbb{V}$ for any $\mathcal{M}$, we see that the natural morphism $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^P_\nu}(\mathcal{M}_1,\mathcal{M}_2)\rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(e)^R}(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}_1),\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}_2))$ provided $\mathcal{M}_2$ is standardly filtered, while $\mathcal{M}_1$ is costandardly filtered.

Similar results hold for $\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu$ and the functor $\mathbb{V}^r$. Pick a projective $\mathcal{P}\in\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$. Then $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{P})$ is a tilting object in $(\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu)^{opp}$ or, equivalently, in $\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu$. In particular, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{P})$ is a standardly filtered object in $\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu$. Also if $\mathcal{M}$ is a standardly filtered object in $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$, then $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M})$ is a standardly filtered object in $(\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu)^{opp}$ and so a costandardly filtered object in $\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu$. So

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^P_\nu}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{P})=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^{P,r}_\nu}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{P}),\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M}))=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}^{opp}-\mathrm{mod}^R}(\mathbb{V}\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{P}),\mathbb{V}\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M})).$$

As we have seen, $H^i\circ\mathbb{V}\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}=H^i\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}\circ\mathbb{V}$. In particular, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}\circ\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P}),\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}\circ\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M})$ are objects of $\mathcal{W}^{opp}$-mod^R_ν isomorphic to $\mathbb{V}\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{P}),\mathbb{V}\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M})$. It follows that

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}^{opp}-\mathrm{mod}^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{P}),\mathbb{V}\circ\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{M}))=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}^{opp}-\mathrm{mod}^R_\nu}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}\circ\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P}),\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{W}}\circ\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M})).$$

But the right hand side is just $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{W}-\mathrm{mod}^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}),\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P}))=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}),\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P}))$. From this argument we deduce that the spaces $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^P_\nu}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{P})$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}),\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{P}))$, at least, have the same dimension. But, as we have seen, the former is included into the latter, so they coincide. For $\mathcal{M}$ we can take another projective, since any projective in $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ is standardly filtered.

4.3.4. *0-faithfulness.* Our goal here is to prove that under a certain assumption on P the functor $\mathbb{V}$ satisfies an even stronger property that the double centralizer one, namely that $\mathbb{V}$ is 0-faithful meaning that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^P_\nu}(\mathcal{M}_1,\mathcal{M}_2)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g},e)^R_\nu}(\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}_1),\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}_2))$ for any standardly filtered objects $\mathcal{M}_1,\mathcal{M}_2$. The condition on P is that the complement to the open orbit of P_0 on $\mathfrak{g}_0(>0)$ has codimension (in $\mathfrak{g}_0(>0)$) bigger than 1. We will elaborate on this condition for $\mathfrak{g}\cong\mathfrak{sl}_n$ in Subsection 6.2.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that P satisfies the condition of the previous paragraph. Then the functor $\mathbb{V}$ is 0-faithful.*

Proof. The 0-faithfulness condition is equivalent to $\mathcal{G}\circ\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})=\mathcal{M}$ for any standardly filtered $\mathcal{M}\in\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is its completion functor $\mathcal{M}\mapsto\mathcal{M}^\wedge$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is the right adjoint, compare with the proof of Proposition 4.2.

First, we reduce to the $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{g}_0$ case. Recall that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})=\prod_{\mu\in\mathfrak{t}^*}\mathcal{F}^0(\mathcal{M}_\mu),\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{N})=\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{G}^0(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ and therefore

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}))=\bigoplus_\mu\mathcal{G}^0(\mathcal{F}^0(\mathcal{M}_\mu)).\tag{4.7}$$

So it is enough to check that $\mathcal{G}^0(\mathcal{F}^0(\mathcal{M}_\mu))=\mathcal{M}_\mu$ for any $\mathfrak{t}$-weight space $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ of $\mathcal{M}$.

We claim that if $\mathcal{M}$ is standardly filtered (in $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$), then any $\mathfrak{t}$-weight space $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is standardly filtered in $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$. It is enough to check this when $\mathcal{M}$ is a parabolic Verma module. We have $\Delta_P(\mu)=\Delta^0(\Delta_{P_0}(\mu))$. So as a $\mathfrak{g}_0$-module, $\Delta_P(\mu)$ is $U(\mathfrak{g}_{<0})\otimes\Delta_{P_0}(\mu)$. So any $\mathfrak{t}$-weight space of $\Delta_P(\mu)$ is the tensor product of $\Delta_{P_0}(\mu)$ with some finite dimensional G_0-module and so is standardly filtered.

The previous paragraph together with (4.7) reduces the proposition to the case when $\mathfrak{g}_0=\mathfrak{g}$ (and e is even). We consider that case until the end of the proof. We remark that to check the equality $\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ for any standardly filtered module $\mathcal{M}$, it suffices to consider the case when $\mathcal{M}$ is a parabolic Verma module.

We need to prove that for a parabolic Verma module $\mathcal{M}$, we have $\mathcal{G}_\hbar(\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi})=\mathcal{M}_\hbar$, where $\mathcal{G}_\hbar$ is the right adjoint functor to $\bullet^{\wedge_\chi}$. Recall, 4.1.4, that $\mathcal{G}_\hbar$ is just taking the maximal subspace where the ν-shifted $\mathfrak{p}$-action integrates to P and the Kazhdan action of $\mathbb{K}^\times$ is locally finite. We remark that the orbit Pe is simply connected and therefore we do not need to take the R/R°-invariants (the R/R°-action is trivial). Below we write $\bullet_{fin}$ instead of $\mathcal{G}_\hbar$. To show that $\mathcal{M}_\hbar = (\mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi})_{fin}$ it is enough to check (compare to [Lo2, Section 3.3]) the analogous equality modulo $\hbar$: i.e., that $M = (M^{\wedge_\chi})_{fin}$, where $M := \mathcal{M}_\hbar/\hbar\mathcal{M}_\hbar$. But we can choose a good filtration on $\mathcal{M}$ such that M is a free $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}(>0)]$-module, say $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}(>0)]^{\oplus n}$. Then we can apply results of [Lo2, Section 3.2] to see that $(M^{\wedge_\chi})_{P-fin} = \mathbb{K}[Pe]^{\oplus n}$. The codimension condition implies that $\mathbb{K}[Pe] = \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}(>0)]$. $\square$

Remark 4.5. The proof of the double centralizer can also be deduced from results of Stroppel, [St1],[St2]. Namely, her results imply that $\mathbb{V}^0$ (that is a quotient functor killing all simples with non-maximal GK dimension) has double centralizer property. We are going to deal with integral categories. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 4.4, it is enough to check that if $\mathcal{P}$ is projective in $\mathcal{O}^P$, then all weight spaces P_μ are projectives in $\mathcal{O}^{P_0}$. If $\mathcal{P}$ is a dominant Verma, then this is checked similarly to the parallel part of the proof of Proposition 4.4. In general, $\mathcal{P}$ is a direct summand in the tensor product of a dominant Verma and a finite dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module. The claim that all $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ are projective easily follows.

4.3.5. *Summary of properties.* Here is the summary of our results describing the properties of the functor $\mathbb{V}$.

Theorem 4.6. *There is an exact functor $\mathbb{V} : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu \to \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_\nu$ with the following properties:*

(i) *The functor $\mathbb{V}$ is a quotient onto its image. It annihilates precisely the modules whose all $\mathfrak{t}$-weight spaces have GK dimension less than* $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0(<0)$.

(ii) *The functor $\mathbb{V}$ intertwines the products with HC bimodules: $\mathbb{V}(X \otimes_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{M}) = X_\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{W}} \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M})$.*

(iii) *Let Δ^0 be the induction functor $U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}_\geqslant)} \bullet$. Then $\mathbb{V}(\Delta^0(\mathcal{M}^0)) = \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0(\mathcal{M}^0))$ for $\mathcal{M}^0 \in \mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu$. Here $\mathbb{V}^0 : \mathcal{O}^{P_0}_\nu \to \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)^R_\nu$ is an analog of $\mathbb{V}$ for $(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$.*

(iv) *The dimension of $\mathbb{V}^0(\mathcal{M}^0)$ coincides with the multiplicity of $\mathcal{M}_0$ (on $P_0 e$). In particular, the character of $\mathbb{V}(\Delta_P(\mu))$ equals* $\dim L_{00}(\mu) e^\mu \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - e^{\mu_i})^{-1}$. *Here $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k$ are the weights of $\mathfrak{t}$ on $\mathfrak{z}_g(e)_{<0}$.*

(v) *$\mathbb{V}$ commutes with the naive duality: $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M}^\vee) = \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{M})^\vee$.*

(vi) *The image of the simple $L(\mu)$ under $\mathbb{V}$ equals $L^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu)))$. In the case when $\nu = 0$, the module $\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu))$ is computed as follows. Let w_0 be the element of the Weyl group W_0 corresponding to μ. To w_0 we can assign the subgroup H_0 in the Lustzig quotient $\bar{A}_0$ associated to $(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ and also an irreducible H_0-module $\mathcal{V}$. Then $\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu))$ is the homogeneous bundle over $\bar{A}_0/H_0$ with fiber $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{N}^0$, where $\mathcal{N}^0$ is the irreducible $\mathcal{W}^0$-module corresponding to the point $eH_0 \in \bar{A}_0/H_0$.*

(vii) *The functor $\mathbb{V}$ has double centralizer property.*

(viii) *Assume that the codimension of $\mathfrak{g}_0(>0) \setminus P_0 e$ in $\mathfrak{g}_0(>0)$ is bigger than* 1. *Then $\mathbb{V}$ is* 0*-faithful.*

Everything but (vi) has already been proved. Let us prove (vi). The description of $\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu))$ follows from the main result of [LO], (ii), the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence, and the special case of (iii) describing the image of $\Delta_{P_0}(\rho)$, see the proof of Proposition 4.2. Now to get the description of $\mathbb{V}(L(\mu))$ one can argue as follows. $\mathbb{V}(L(\mu))$ is a quotient of $\mathbb{V}(\Delta^0(L_0(\mu))) = \Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu)))$. The object $\mathbb{V}(L(\mu)) \in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R$ is simple thanks to (i). But $\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu))$ is a simple object in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)^R$. So the object $\Delta^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu))) \in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R$ has simple head, $L^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{V}^0(L_0(\mu)))$, and therefore this head has to be isomorphic to $\mathbb{V}(L(\mu))$.

We recall that it is parts (iv) and (vi) that allow us to compute the characters of the modules $L^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{N}^0) \in \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$. We have mentioned already that these characters do not depend on the choice of $\mathcal{N}^0$ in the $A_0(e) = R/R^\circ$-orbit. This is because the $A_0(e)$-action on the classes of irreducibles in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)_\nu$ does not change the character and the functor $L^\theta_{\mathcal{W}}$ intertwines the $A_0(e)$-actions on the classes of simples in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ and in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

5. Goldie ranks

In this section we fix a special orbit $\mathbb{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ and take the W-algebra $\mathcal{W}$ for that orbit. Let $\mathbf{c}$ be the two-sided cell corresponding to $\mathbb{O}$. By c_w we denote the left cell in $\mathbf{c}$ containing an element w.

5.1. **Reminders on Goldie ranks.** In this subsection we will recall a few classical facts about Goldie ranks proved by Joseph.

First of all, following Joseph, we will consider some new algebras. Namely, consider the algebra $L(L(w\lambda), L(w\lambda))$. It is known, see [Jo1, 2.5] that this algebra is prime and noetherian, so has Goldie rank. For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ let $\mathrm{g}_w(\lambda)$ denote the Goldie rank of $L(L(w\lambda), L(w\lambda))$.

Each left cell c has a unique distinguished involution d_c called a Duflo involution. As Joseph proved in [Jo1] for each dominant λ compatible with d_c we have

$$\mathrm{Grk}(\mathcal{U}/J(d_c\lambda)) = \mathrm{g}_{d_c}(\lambda). \tag{5.1}$$

So the collection $\mathrm{g}_w(\lambda)$ contains all Goldie ranks that we have originally wanted to compute.

According to [Jo1, Corollary 5.12] there is a polynomial $q_w(\lambda)$ such that $\mathrm{g}_w(\lambda) = q_w(\lambda)$ for all dominant λ compatible with w (we remark that our notation here is different from Joseph's; we write $q_w(\lambda)$ for what Joseph in [Jo2] would denote $\tilde{q}_w(\lambda)$; for Joseph $q_w(\lambda) = \mathrm{g}_w(w^{-1}\lambda)$). In particular, we have $\mathrm{Grk}(\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda)) = p_w(\lambda)$, where $p_w(\lambda) = q_{d_c}(\lambda), w \in c$. The polynomials $p_w(\lambda)$ are called *Goldie rank polynomials*. Furthermore, the quotient $q_w(\lambda)/p_w(\lambda)$ is independent of λ and is a positive integer independent of λ. This positive integer is known as Joseph's *scale factor* and is denoted by z_w. In fact, below we will only need to know that z_w is a number bigger than 1 (the equality $\mathrm{Grk}(\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda)) \leqslant \mathrm{g}_w(\lambda)$ is a consequence of the inclusion $\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda) \subset L(L(w\lambda), L(w\lambda))$ that is provided by the $\mathcal{U}$-action on $L(w\lambda)$ – such an inclusion implies the inequality, see [W]; but the claim that the ratio is independent of λ is not so easily seen). A crucial property of the polynomials $p_w(\lambda)$ with $w \in \mathbf{c}$ is that their span is an irreducible W-submodule of $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{h}^*]$, see [Jo2, Theorem 5.5]. This submodule is isomorphic to the special W-module in $\mathbf{c}$. Moreover, if we choose elements $w_1, \ldots, w_k$, one in each left cell of $\mathbf{c}$, then the polynomials $p_{w_1}, \ldots, p_{w_k}$ form a basis in the submodule.

In [Jo2, Theorem 5.1] Joseph determined the polynomial p_w up to a scalar multiple. So to complete the Goldie ranks computation one needs to determine a collection of scalars, say s_c, one for each left cell σ. As Joseph, basically, pointed out in [Jo2, Remark 1 in 5.5], if one knows the scale factors z_w for all $w \in \mathbf{c}$, then one can, in principle, determine the scalars s_c for all left cells $c \subset \mathbf{c}$ up to a common scalar multiple. Let us explain how this works.

In [Jo2, 5.5, Remark 1], Joseph finds a formula expressing $y.q_w, y \in W, w \in \mathbf{c}$ as a linear combination of elements $q_{w'}$ with $w' \in \mathbf{c}$. The coefficients are expressed in terms of the multiplicities in the BGG category $\mathcal{O}$ and so are known. If one knows the coefficients z_w for all $w \in \mathbf{c}$, then one can express $y.p_{w_i}$ in terms of the $p_{w_j}, j = 1, \ldots, k$, say

$$y.p_{w_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} b^i_j(y) p_{w_j}. \tag{5.2}$$

But the elements p_{w_j} are linearly independent and their span is an irreducible W-module so the basis $(p_{w_i})_{i=1}^k$ is determined uniquely up to a scalar multiple.

That single multiple can be determined uniquely if one knows that there is $w \in \mathbf{c}$ such that $p_w(\lambda) = 1$ for some $\lambda \in P$. The latter happens if there are compatible $w \in \mathbf{c}$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ such that $J(w\lambda)$ is completely prime, i.e., $\operatorname{Grk}(\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda)) = 1$. In fact, there is a conjecture of Joseph saying that for each $w \in \mathbf{c}$ there is $\lambda \in P$ with $p_w(\lambda) = 1$ (of course, generally λ will not be dominant).

To finish this subsection let us mention that Joseph also had a conjecture computing the scale factors z_w, see [Jo3, 5.3]. It is unclear to us whether his conjecture is compatible with Theorem 1.3.

5.2. **Scale factors: Joseph vs Premet.** Let $w \in \mathbf{c}$. The goal of this subsection is to provide a formula for Joseph's scale factors z_w, see Subsection 5.1, in terms of the triple $x, y, \mathcal{V}$ corresponding to w and certain numbers that we call *Premet's scale factors*[1] that are given by

$$\operatorname{pr}_w(\lambda) = \frac{d_w(\lambda)}{p_w(\lambda)}.$$

Here λ is a dominant weight compatible with w, $p_w(\lambda)$ is the Goldie rank of $J(w\lambda)$, and $d_w(\lambda)$ is the dimension of the irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-module lying over $J(w\lambda)$. Of course, $\operatorname{pr}_w(\lambda)$ depends only on c_w and λ (below we will see that it is actually independent of λ).

Pick a regular dominant weight ϱ. Recall that we represent $w \in \mathbf{c}$ as a triple $(x, y, \mathcal{V})$, see Subsection 2.4. Below we write $\mathbb{K}$ for the trivial $\bar{A}_{(x,y)}$-module. Let Y denote the subset of Y^Λ consisting of all irreducibles with central character ϱ. Below for $x \in Y$ lying over a primitive ideal $\mathcal{J} = J(w\varrho)$ we write $d_x := d_w(\varrho), \mathrm{g}_x := p_w(\varrho), \operatorname{pr}_x := \operatorname{pr}_w(\varrho)$.

Proposition 5.1. *We have*

$$z_w = \frac{\operatorname{pr}_x}{\operatorname{pr}_y} \cdot \frac{|\bar{A}_y|}{|\bar{A}_{x,y}|} \dim \mathcal{V}.$$

Proof. Set

$$\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda) := L(\Delta(\varrho), L(w\lambda)), m_w(\lambda) := \operatorname{mult}_{\mathbb{O}} \mathcal{M}_w(\lambda),$$

and $\mathrm{g}_w(\lambda) := \operatorname{Grk}(L(L(w\lambda), L(w\lambda)))$. Below we only consider λ compatible with w.

Lemma 5.2. *The ratio $\frac{m_w(\lambda)}{\mathrm{g}_w(\lambda)}$ depends only on the right cell containing w (equivalently, on $c_{w^{-1}}$).*

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We have $m_w(\lambda) = e(\mathcal{M}_w(\lambda))/e(\mathbb{K}[\mathbb{O}])$, where e is the Gelfand-Kirillov multiplicity, for the definition of $e(\bullet)$ see, say, [Ja, Kapitel 8]. Now the result follows from [Ja, 12.5]. $\square$

---

[1] The attribution to Premet is made because of his beautiful result saying that this scale factor is always integral. The first version of our proof below used that result. In fact – as was communicated to the author by Premet – one does not need that in the proof, it is enough to use the fact that the scale factor is bigger or equal than 1, which was established by the author. It is pleasant when somebody else understands your work better than you do...

Below we write m_w, g_w for $m_w(\varrho), \mathrm{g}_w(\varrho)$.

By the definition of $z_\bullet$ we have

$$z_{x,y,\mathcal{V}} = \frac{\mathrm{g}_{x,y,\mathcal{V}}}{\mathrm{g}_x}. \tag{5.3}$$

(5.1) together with the observation that a Duflo involution corresponds to a triple of the form $(x, x, \mathbb{K})$, see Subsection 2.4, imply $\mathrm{g}_x = \mathrm{g}_{(x,x,\mathbb{K})}$. By Proposition 5.2, the ratio $\frac{m_{x,y,\mathcal{V}}}{\mathrm{g}_{x,y,\mathcal{V}}}$ depends only on the left cell corresponding to y. In particular,

$$\frac{m_{x,y,\mathcal{V}}}{\mathrm{g}_{x,y,\mathcal{V}}} = \frac{m_{y,y,\mathbb{K}}}{\mathrm{g}_{y,y,\mathbb{K}}}. \tag{5.4}$$

Plugging (2.1),(5.3) into (5.4) we get

$$\frac{d_x d_y |\bar{A}| \dim \mathcal{V}}{z_{x,y,\mathcal{V}}\, \mathrm{g}_x\, |\bar{A}_{x,y}|} = \frac{d_y^2 |\bar{A}|}{\mathrm{g}_y\, |\bar{A}_y|} \Rightarrow$$

$$z_{x,y,\mathcal{V}} = \frac{d_x d_y |\bar{A}| \dim \mathcal{V}\, \mathrm{g}_y\, |\bar{A}_y|}{d_y^2 |\bar{A}|\, \mathrm{g}_x\, |\bar{A}_{x,y}|} = \frac{\mathrm{pr}_x}{\mathrm{pr}_y} \frac{|\bar{A}_y|}{|\bar{A}_{x,y}|} \dim \mathcal{V}.$$

☐

5.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.3 modulo Conjecture 1.1.**

Proposition 5.3. *Let w, λ be compatible. Then $\mathrm{pr}_w(\lambda)$ depends only on the left cell containing w.*

Proof. First of all, recall that $\mathrm{Grk}(\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda)) = p_w(\lambda)$ for some polynomial p. Also the multiplicity $\mathrm{mult}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda))$ equals to some polynomial $P_w(\lambda)$ and this polynomial is proportional to $p_w(\lambda)^2$, see [Ja]. But, on the other hand, according to (2.1), we have $\mathrm{mult}_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathcal{U}/J(w\lambda)) = |\bar{A}/H_{c_w}| d_w(\lambda)^2$. So $d_w(\lambda) = \tilde{p}_w(\lambda)$ for some polynomial $\tilde{p}_w(\lambda)$ proportional to $p_w(\lambda)$. This implies the claim. ☐

For a cell $c := c_w$ we will write $\mathrm{pr}_c := \mathrm{pr}_w(\lambda)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 modulo Conjecture 1.1. Consider the case when the orbit $\mathbb{O}$ is not one of the three exceptional orbits.

Suppose that $x, y \in Y$ are such that $\bar{A}_x \supset \bar{A}_y$ and let $\dim \mathcal{V} = 1$. Then $z_w = \frac{\mathrm{pr}_x}{\mathrm{pr}_y}$. In particular, since $z_w \geqslant 1$, we have $\mathrm{pr}_x \geqslant \mathrm{pr}_y$. According to [Lo1], Proposition 3.4.6, $\mathrm{pr}_y \geqslant 1$. So if $\mathrm{pr}_x = 1$ and $\bar{A}_x = \bar{A}$, then $\mathrm{pr}_y = 1$ for all $y \in Y$.

Thanks to Conjecture 1.1, there is a (possibly singular) $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and $w \in \mathbf{c}$ as in Theorem 1.3 such that $d_w(\lambda) = 1$ (and hence $\mathrm{pr}_w(\lambda) = 1$) and the $\bar{A}$-orbit corresponding to $J(w\lambda)$ is a single point. Then the $\bar{A}$-orbit corresponding to $J(w\varrho)$ is also a single point. Let c be the left cell containing w. Then, thanks to Proposition 5.3, $\mathrm{pr}_c = \mathrm{pr}_w(\lambda) = 1$. Now it remains to use the result of the previous paragraph.

If $\mathbb{O}$ is one of the three exceptional orbits, then $\bar{A}_x = \{1\}$ for all $x \in Y$. One carries the argument above to this case without any noticeable modifications. ☐

5.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.**

5.4.1. *Reduction to weakly rigid orbits.* We start the proof of Theorem 1.2 by introducing a certain induction procedure related to the Lusztig-Spaltenstein induction.

Let us introduce a certain class of special nilpotent orbits: *weakly rigid* ones[2]. Then we will show that it is enough to prove Conjecture 1.1 for weakly rigid orbits only.

Recall that $\mathbb{O}$ is called *rigid* if it cannot be induced from a nilpotent orbit in a proper Levi subalgebra.

Definition 5.4. We say that a special orbit $\mathbb{O}$ is *weakly rigid* if there is no parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, Levi subalgebra $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ and a nilpotent orbit $\underline{\mathbb{O}} \subset \underline{\mathfrak{g}}$ such that:

1. $\underline{\mathbb{O}}$ is special in $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$.
2. Pick $e \in \mathbb{O} \cap (\underline{\mathbb{O}} + \mathfrak{n})$. Then the projection of $Z_P(e)$ to the Lusztig quotient $\bar{A}$ for $\mathbb{O}$ is surjective.

We are going to use the parabolic induction recalled in Subsection 2.5 In particular, let $\underline{N}$ be a 1-dimensional $\underline{\mathcal{W}}$-module with integral central character. It follows from [Lo4], Corollary 6.3.3, that $\varsigma(\underline{N})$ also has integral central character. Now assume in addition that $\underline{N}$ is $A(\underline{e})$-stable, where $\underline{e} \in \underline{\mathbb{O}}$ is the projection of e along $\mathfrak{n}$ and $A(\underline{e})$ stands for the component group of the centralizer of $\underline{e}$ in $\underline{G}$. Then both $\underline{N}, \varsigma(\underline{N})$ are $\underline{Q}$-stable. So we see that if condition (2) holds, then $\varsigma(\underline{N})$ is $A(e)$-stable.

Summarizing, we see that it is enough to prove Conjecture 1.1 only for weakly rigid orbits. We will provide a complete proof only in type B. Then we explain modification necessary for types C, D.

5.4.2. *Type B.* We start by recalling a few standard facts about nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$. For details the reader is referred to [CM],[McG2].

First of all, nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$ are parameterized by partitions λ of $2n+1$ having type B, i.e., such that every even part appears with even multiplicity. In general, for any partition λ of $2n+1$ there is the largest (with respect to the dominance) partition λ_B of type B smaller than or equal to λ. The partition λ_B is called the *B-collapse* of λ.

A partition λ corresponds to a special orbit if and only if the transposed partition λ^t is again of type B. Explicitly, this means that there is an even number of odd parts between any two consecutive even parts or smaller than the smallest even part, but there is an odd number of odd parts larger than the largest even part.

Now let us explain what the Lusztig-Spaltenstein induction does on the level of partitions. Any Levi subalgebra in $\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$ has the form $\mathfrak{gl}_{n_k} \times \mathfrak{gl}_{n_{k-1}} \times \ldots \mathfrak{gl}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{so}_{2n_0+1}$ with $\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i = n$. The induction procedure is associative so it is enough to see what happens when we induce from an orbit $\underline{\mathbb{O}} = (0, \mathbb{O}_0) \subset \mathfrak{gl}_m \times \mathfrak{so}_{2(n-m)+1}$. Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_l)$ with $l \geqslant m+1$ be the partition of $\mathbb{O}_0$ (we add zero parts if necessary). Then the partition λ corresponding to the induced orbit $\mathbb{O}$ is

(a) either $(\mu_1+2, \ldots, \mu_m+2, \mu_{m+1}, \ldots, \mu_l)$ if the latter orbit is of type B,
(b) or $(\mu_1+2, \ldots, \mu_{m-1}+2, \mu_m+1, \mu_{m+1}+1, \mu_{m+2}, \ldots, \mu_l)$ otherwise.

In other words, λ is always the B-collapse of the partition in (a).

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that the partition of* $\mathbb{O}$ *is obtained as in (a). Then the conditions of Definition 5.4 are satisfied.*

---

[2] These are basically the same as so called *birationally rigid* orbits.

Proof. The claim that (1) is satisfied is straightforward.

We will specify the choice of a parabolic P and then choose an element e as in (2) to compute $Z_P(e)$ and see that actually $Z_P(e)$ projects surjectively to $A(e)$.

We represent $\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$ as the Lie algebra of matrices that are skew-symmetric with respect to the main anti-diagonal (so that the symmetric form used to define $\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$ is $(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^{2n+1} x_i y_{2n+2-i}$). Choose the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}$ with Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}_m \times \mathfrak{so}_{2(n-m)+1}$ in a standard way, i.e., $\mathfrak{p}$ contains the subalgebra of upper triangular matrices.

Let us specify an element $e_0 \in \mathbb{O}_0$. Consider the numbers $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m$ and split them into q pairs of equal numbers and p pairwise different numbers. Then take the remaining numbers $\mu_{m+1}, \ldots, \mu_l$ and do the same getting q' pairs and p' pairwise different numbers. E.g., for $m = 6, \mu = (5^3, 4^2, 3^4, 2^2, 1^2)$ (as usual the superscripts are the multiplicities) we have $q = 2$ (with pairs $(5,5), (4,4)$), $p = 2$ (with numbers 5 and 3), $q' = 3$ (the pairs $(3,3), (2,2)$ and $(1,1)$) and $p' = 1$ (corresponding to 3).

Take the subspace $\mathbb{K}^{2(n-m)+1} \subset \mathbb{K}^{2n+1}$, where $\mathfrak{so}_{2(n-m)+1}$ acts, and represent it as a direct sum of subspaces

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} V_i \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{q} (U_i \oplus U_i^*) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p'} V_i' \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{q'} (U_i' \oplus U_i'^*),$$

where $V_1, \ldots, V_p, V_1', \ldots, V_{p'}'$ are orthogonal subspaces of dimensions equal to single μ_i's $(5, 3, 3$ in our example), and $U_1, \ldots, U_q, U_1', \ldots U_{q'}'$ are isotropic subspaces of dimensions equal to μ_i's from pairs $(5, 4, 3, 2, 1$ in our example), $U_1^*, \ldots, U_q^*, U_1'^*, \ldots, U_{q'}'^*$ are dual isotropic subspaces. Below we denote by $v_1(i), \ldots, v_{2d+1}(i)$ a basis in V_i, where the form is written as above, by $u_1(j), \ldots, u_d(j)$ a basis in U_j, and by $u_1^*(j), \ldots, u_d^*(j)$ the dual basis in U_j^*. By $v_m^n(i)$ we denote the matrix unit sending $v_n(i)$ to $v_m(i)$. The notation $u_m^n(i), u_m^{*n}(i)$ has a similar meaning.

For e_0 we take

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p} e_0(k) + \sum_{k=1}^{q} f_0(k) + \sum_{k=1}^{p'} e_0'(k) + \sum_{k=1}^{q'} f_0'(k).$$

The element $e_0(k)$ is given by the matrix $\sum_{i=1}^{d} (v_i^{i+1}(k) - v_{i+d}^{i+d+1}(k))$, where $\dim V_k = 2d+1$. The element $f_0(k)$ is given by the matrix $\sum_{i=1}^{d} u_i^{i+1}(k) - \sum_{i=1}^{d} u^{*i+1}_{i}(k)$, where $d = \dim U_i$. The operators $e_0'(k) \in \mathfrak{so}(V_k'), f_0'(k) \in \mathfrak{so}(U_k' \oplus U_k'^*)$ are defined similarly. It is clear from the construction that $e_0 \in \underline{\mathbb{O}}$.

Now let us specify e. Set $\widetilde{V}_i := V_i \oplus \mathbb{K}^2$, where $\mathbb{K}^2$ is viewed as an orthogonal space with isotropic basis $v_0(i), v_{2d+2}(i)$, and $\widetilde{U}_i := U_i \oplus \mathbb{K}^2$, where $\mathbb{K}^2$ is viewed as an isotropic space with basis $u_0(i), u_{d+1}(i)$. Then, of course

$$\mathbb{K}^{2n} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^{p} \widetilde{V}_k \oplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{q} (\widetilde{U}_k \oplus \widetilde{U}_k^*) \oplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{p'} V_k' \oplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{q'} (U_k' \oplus U_k'^*).$$

Now we set

$$e := \sum_{k=1}^{p} e(k) + \sum_{k=1}^{q} f(k) + \sum_{k=1}^{p'} e_0'(k) + \sum_{k=1}^{q'} f_0'(k),$$

where the matrices $e(k), f(k)$ are defined as follows. We set $e(k) := \sum_{i=0}^{d} (v_i^{i+1}(k) - v_{i+d+1}^{i+d+2}(k))$. Further, $f(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} u_i^{i+1}(k) - \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} u^{*i+1}_{i}(k)$. It is clear that $e \in \mathbb{O}$.

Let P be the maximal parabolic subgroup in $\mathrm{O}(2n+1)$ (note that we take a disconnected group) stabilizing the m-dimensional subspace spanned by all basis vectors $v_0(k), u_0(k), u_0^*(k)$. With this choice of P we have $e\in e_0+\mathfrak{n}$. Now let us produce elements in the Levi subgroup $\mathrm{GL}_m\times \mathrm{O}_{2(n-m)+1}$ whose images span the component group of $Z_{\mathrm{O}_{2n+1}}(e)$ (this will imply condition (2)). This component group is the sum of several copies of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, one for each different odd part of λ. More precisely, let $\lambda=(\lambda_1^{n_1},\lambda_2^{n_2},\ldots\lambda_s^{n_s})$. Then the reductive part of $Z_{\mathrm{O}_n}(e)$ is $\prod_{i=1}^k G_{n_i}$, where G_{n_i} means O_{n_i} if λ_i is odd, and Sp_{n_i} if λ_i (and then automatically n_i) is even. We have one involution in the basis of the component group for each $G_{n_i}=\mathrm{O}_{n_i}$.

Let us produce elements $g_i\in \mathrm{O}(\widetilde{V_i})\cap(\mathrm{GL}_m\times \mathrm{O}_{2(n-m)+1})$ centralizing $e(i)$, and $h_j\in \mathrm{O}(\widetilde{U_j}\oplus\widetilde{U_j^*})\cap(\mathrm{GL}_m\times \mathrm{O}_{2(n-m)+1})$ centralizing $f(j)$. For g_i we just take $-\mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{V_i}}$. If $\dim U_j$ is even, then we set $h_j=\mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{U_j}}$. Finally, suppose $\dim U_j$ is odd. Then define h_j by $h_j(u_k(j)):=\sqrt{-1}u_k^*(j), h_j(u_k^*(j))=-\sqrt{-1}u_k(j)$. It is easy to see that h_j defined in this way lies in the required subgroup and centralizes $f(j)$.

From the description of the component group given above we see that the elements g_i, h_j generate the component group. $\square$

From Lemma 5.5 we deduce that the partition of a weakly rigid orbit has the form $((2k+1)^{2d_{2k+1}-1},(2k)^{2d_{2k}},(2k-1)^{2d_{2k-1}},\ldots,2^{2d_2},1^{2d_1})$, where $d_{2k+1},d_{2k},\ldots,d_1$ are positive integers. It seems that any partition like this indeed corresponds to a weakly rigid orbit, but we will not need this.

Let us produce an explicit $\mu\in\Lambda$ such that $\mathrm{mult}_{\mathbb{O}}\,\mathcal{U}/J(\mu)=1$. According to (2.1) for a corresponding irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-module x we will have $\bar{A}_x=\bar{A}, d_x=1$ as needed in Conjecture 1.1. This will be a so called Arthur-Barbasch-Vogan weight, see, for example, [BV]. Let us recall how this weight is constructed in general.

There is a duality for nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$ and in the Langlands dual Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ (B_n and C_n are dual to each other, while all other simple algebras are self-dual). This duality (called Barbash-Vogan-Spaltenstein duality) is an order reversing bijection between the sets of special orbits. Take a special orbit $\mathbb{O}\subset\mathfrak{g}$ and let $\mathbb{O}^\vee\subset\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ be the corresponding dual orbit. Let $(e^\vee,h^\vee,f^\vee)$ be the corresponding $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple. Recall that we have fixed Cartan and Borel subalgebras $\mathfrak{h}\subset\mathfrak{b}\subset\mathfrak{g}$. Then we can take $\mathfrak{h}^\vee:=\mathfrak{h}^*$ for a Cartan subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ and also we have a preferred choice of a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}^\vee\subset\mathfrak{g}^\vee$. Conjugating $h^\vee$ we may assume that $h^\vee$ is dominant in $\mathfrak{h}^*$. This determines $h^\vee$ uniquely. The weight of interest is $\mu:=\frac{1}{2}h^\vee$.

For the classical Lie algebras the duality between nilpotent orbits can be described on the level of partitions. For example, take $\mathbb{O}\subset\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}$ and let λ be the corresponding partition. For a partition μ of $2n+1$, let $l(\mu)$ denote the partition of $2n$ obtained from μ by decreasing the smallest part of μ by 1. Recall that the nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$ are parameterized by partitions of type C, i.e., such that the multiplicity of each odd part is even. For any partition μ' of $2n$ we can define its C-collapse μ'_C that is a partition of type C similarly to the B-collapse. Now the duality sends the orbit $\mathbb{O}$ with partition λ to the orbit $\mathbb{O}^\vee$ with partition $[l(\lambda^t)]_C$, see, for instance, [McG1], Theorem 5.1 and the discussion after it. It is easy to see that $[l(\lambda^t)]_C$ consists of even parts and so the orbit $\mathbb{O}^\vee$ is even, meaning that all eigenvalues of $\mathrm{ad}(h^\vee)$ are even. In particular, $\frac{1}{2}h^\vee\in\Lambda^+$.

According to [BV, Proposition 5.10], $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{U}/J(\frac{1}{2}h^\vee))=\overline{\mathbb{O}}$. Further, [McG1, Corollary 5.19] implies that the multiplicity of $\mathcal{U}/J(\frac{1}{2}h^\vee)$ on $\mathbb{O}$ is 1.

5.4.3. *Type C.* The proofs of Conjecture 1.1 in types C and D are very similar. So we will only explain the necessary modifications.

As we have already mentioned, the nilpotent orbits in type C are parameterized by partitions of type C. A partition λ corresponds to a special orbit if and only if λ^t is again of type C. Explicitly this means that there is even number of odd parts between two consecutive even parts and also even number of even parts larger than the largest odd part. On the level of partitions the Lusztig-Spaltenstein induction is described completely analogously to type B. Also one can prove a direct analog of Lemma 5.5 and the proof basically repeats the original one. From here we see that the partition of a weakly rigid orbit has the form $(n^{d_n},(n-1)^{d_{n-1}},\ldots 1^{d_1})$, where $d_1,\ldots,d_n$ are positive even integers.

On the level of partitions the duality is described as follows. For a partition λ of $2n$ let $r(\lambda)$ be the partition of $2n+1$ obtained from λ by increasing the largest part by 1. Now a partition λ of a special orbit $\mathbb{O}\subset\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}$ is sent to $[r(\lambda^t)]_B$, where, recall, the subscript B means the B-collapse. It is easy to see that all parts of $[r(\lambda^t)]_B$ are odd, meaning that the corresponding orbit is even. So it remains to take the ideal $J(\frac{1}{2}h^\vee)$ and use the results of Barbasch-Vogan and of McGovern, exactly as in type B.

5.4.4. *Type D.* Nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{so}_{2n}$ are parameterized by partitions of $2n$ of type D: each even part occurs even number of times (in fact, this is only true for the O_{2n}-action, each partition with all parts even produces exactly two SO_{2n}-orbits, while all other partitions correspond to a single SO_{2n}-orbit). A partition λ corresponds to a special orbit if and only if λ^t is of type C (not D!), i.e., there is even number of odd parts between any two consecutive even parts, larger than the largest even part, and smaller than the smallest even part.

The Lusztig-Spaltenstein induction is described in the same way as above, and an analog of Lemma 5.5 with the same proof holds. From here we deduce that the partition of a weakly rigid orbit has the form $(n^{d_n},(n-1)^{d_{n-1}},\ldots 1^{d_1})$, where $d_1,\ldots,d_n$ are positive even integers.

The duality sends an orbit with partition λ to orbit with partition $[\lambda^t]_D$, where the subscript D means the D-collapse, i.e., the largest partition of type D smaller than a given one. It is easy to see that for λ as specified in the previous paragraph, all parts of $[\lambda^t]_D$ are odd. In particular, the dual orbit is even, the weight $\frac{1}{2}h^\vee$ is integral, and we are again done.

5.4.5. *A few remarks towards the exceptional cases.* We hope that for the exceptional Lie algebras the same strategy as above should work. Namely, one should be able to describe all weakly rigid orbits. Then, hopefully, the dual of a weakly rigid orbit will be even (this is true for all rigid orbits, as was checked in [BV])[3]. Then one can hope that $\mathcal{U}/J(\frac{1}{2}h^\vee)$ will have multiplicity 1 on $\mathbb{O}$.

In [Lo4] we have developed some techniques to classify one-dimensional representations of W-algebras under certain conditions on the nilpotent element e. The most important condition is that the algebra $\mathfrak{q}=\mathfrak{z}_\mathfrak{g}(e,h,f)$ is semisimple. This condition is satisfied for all rigid orbits but not for all weakly rigid ones (it is peculiar that in classical types a weakly rigid orbit is rigid precisely when $\mathfrak{q}$ is semisimple, this can be deduced from the classification of rigid orbits provided, for instance, in [CM]). Another condition on e that significantly simplifies the classification is that e is principal in some Levi. This holds for all weakly rigid (special) orbits in classical algebras.

The classification result obtained in [Lo4] (for elements e subject to the conditions explained in the previous paragraph) takes the following form. It establishes a family X of elements in $\mathfrak{h}^*$ (given by several conditions, the most implicit being that $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{U}/J(\lambda)) = \overline{\mathbb{O}}$ for each $\lambda \in X$) such that X is in bijection with 1-dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-modules in such a way that the primitive ideal corresponding to the 1-dimensional module attached to $\lambda \in X$ is $J(\lambda)$. For several rigid special elements the element $\frac{1}{2}h^\vee$ is in X, but for some it is not, which, however, does not mean that $J(\frac{1}{2}h^\vee)$ does not correspond to a 1-dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-module simply because the weight cannot be recovered from an ideal uniquely.

---

[3] As I learned from Jeffrey Adams there is only one weakly rigid orbit, where this is not true: it appears in type E_8

Finally, let us remark that even if $\mathfrak{q}$ is not semisimple, it is still possible sometimes possible to get some ramification of the classification result that will classify $A(e)$-stable 1-dimensional modules, see [Lo4], Corollary 5.2.2.

6. Supplements

6.1. **Functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ for Harish-Chandra modules.**

6.1.1. *Setting.* Our setting in this subsection is very different from the one in the main body of the paper. We fix an involutive antiautomorphism τ of G (so that $x \mapsto \tau(x)^{-1}$ is an involutive automorphism). We set $K := \{g \in G | \tau(g) = g^{-1}\}^\circ$, this is a reductive subgroup of G. Further set $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{g}^\tau$ so that we have $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$.

We pick $e \in \mathfrak{p}$. Then we can choose h, f forming an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple with e in such a way that $h \in \mathfrak{k}$ and $f \in \mathfrak{p}$. It is known (and easy to check) that the intersection of Ge with $\mathfrak{p}$ is a union of finitely many K-orbits, each being a lagrangian subvariety in Ge. As before, we take $V = [\mathfrak{g}, f]$. Then $U := \mathfrak{k} \cap V$ coincides with $[\mathfrak{p}, f]$ and is a lagrangian subspace in V. Further, $\chi = (e, \cdot)$ clearly vanishes on $\mathfrak{k}$. So the pair (K, V) does satisfy the assumptions of 4.1.1.

So we can get a functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e} : \mathcal{O}^K \to \mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R$. In fact, the functor is easier to construct then in the general case and we also can get some restriction on its image, it consists of "HC-modules for $(\mathcal{W}, \tau)$". We are going to define those in the next part in a more general context.

6.1.2. *Harish-Chandra modules for almost commutative algebras.* Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital associative algebra equipped with an exhaustive algebra filtration $\mathbb{K} = \mathcal{A}_{\leqslant 0} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\leqslant 1} \subset \ldots$. Assume that $[\mathcal{A}_{\leqslant i}, \mathcal{A}_{\leqslant j}] \subset \mathcal{A}_{\leqslant i+j-d}$ for some positive integer d. Finally, assume that $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{A}$ is a finitely generated algebra.

Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is equipped with an involutive antiautomorphism τ that preserves the filtration. By definition, a HC $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$-module is an $\mathcal{A}$-module $\mathcal{M}$ that can be equipped with an increasing exhaustive filtration $\mathcal{M}_{\leqslant 0} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\leqslant 1} \subset \ldots$ that is compatible with the filtration on $\mathcal{A}$ (in the sense that $\mathcal{A}_{\leqslant i}\mathcal{M}_{\leqslant j} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\leqslant i+j}$) satisfying the following two additional conditions:

(i) $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{M}$ is a finitely generated $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{A}$-module.
(ii) If $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\leqslant i}$ satisfies $\tau(a) = -a$, then $a\mathcal{M}_{\leqslant j} \subset \mathcal{M}_{i+j-d}$.

Let us consider two examples supporting this definition.

First, let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{U}$ and choose τ as in 6.1.1. In this example, we take the PBW filtration and so $d = 1$. We claim that a HC $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$-module is the same as a HC $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$-module, i.e., a finitely generated module with locally finite action of $\mathfrak{k}$. Let $\mathcal{U}^\tau$, resp. $\mathcal{U}^{-\tau}$, denote the subspace of the elements $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\tau(u) = u$, resp. $\tau(u) = -u$. Then it is easy to see that $\mathcal{U}^{-\tau}_{\leqslant i} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\leqslant i-1}\mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathcal{U}_{\leqslant i-1}$. It follows that a HC $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$-module satisfies (ii). Now (i) becomes a well-known claim that one has a good $\mathfrak{k}$-stable filtration on any HC $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$-module. The claim that a HC $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$-module is HC as a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$-module is easy.

Let us proceed to the second special case. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a filtered algebra with an almost-commutativity condition analogous to the condition on $\mathcal{A}$ above. Set $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B}^{opp}$ and let τ be defined by $\tau(b_1 \otimes b_2) := b_2 \otimes b_1$. Of course, an $\mathcal{A}$-module is just a $\mathcal{B}$-bimodule. We claim that a HC $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$-module is the same thing as a HC $\mathcal{B}$-bimodule in the sense of [Lo2], i.e., a filtered bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ with $[\mathcal{B}_{\leqslant i}, \mathcal{M}_{\leqslant j}] \subset \mathcal{M}_{i+j-d}$ such that $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{M}$ is a finitely generated $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{B}$-module.

First, since $b \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes b$ lies in $\mathcal{A}^{-\tau}$, we see that a HC $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$-module $\mathcal{M}$ is a HC $\mathcal{B}$-bimodule (condition (ii) just says that $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{M}$ is finitely generated as a $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{B}$-bimodule but thanks to (i) the left and right actions of $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{B}$ on $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{M}$ coincide). On the other hand, the space $\mathcal{A}^{-\tau}$ is the linear span of the elements of the form $b_1 \otimes b_2 - b_2 \otimes b_1$. Using this it is easy to see that a HC $\mathcal{B}$-bimodule is a HC $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$-module.

6.1.3. *Functor* $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. As we have mentioned the construction of $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ is easier than in the general case: we do not need to fix $\iota : V \to \tilde{I}_\chi$ as in 4.1.2: any $R \times \mathbb{K}^\times \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and also τ-equivariant ι works. The functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ is constructed by complete analogy with [Lo2], a crucial thing to notice is that $(\mathbb{A}_\hbar^{\wedge_0})^{-\tau} \mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi} \subset \hbar^2 \mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$ because $(\mathcal{U}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi})^{-\tau} \mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi} \subset \hbar^2 \mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi}$. It follows that $[\mathfrak{p}, f] \mathcal{M}_\hbar^{\wedge_\chi} \subset \hbar^2 \mathcal{M}^{\wedge_\chi}$.

Also this description shows that, for a HC $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-module $\mathcal{M}$, the image of $\mathcal{M}$ under $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ is an R-equivariant HC $(\mathcal{W}, \tau)$-module.

6.2. **Another functor $\bullet_\dagger$ for $\mathcal{O}^P$.**

6.2.1. $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ *for a general parabolic category* $\mathcal{O}$. Now we again change our setting. Let P be an arbitrary parabolic in G. Let e be a Richardson element of $\mathfrak{p}^\perp$ meaning that Pe is dense in $\mathfrak{p}^\perp$. Then we can choose h, f forming an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple in such a way that $h \in \mathfrak{p}$, see [Lo4, Lemma 6.1.3]. Let $V = [\mathfrak{g}, f]$. Since $\mathfrak{z}_g(e) \subset \mathfrak{p}$, see [LS, Theorem 1.3], it is easy to see that $V \cap \mathfrak{p}$ is a lagrangian subspace in V. So we can construct produce a functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ from the parabolic category $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ to the category $\mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R_\nu$, where recall R is a maximal reductive subgroup of $Z_P(e)$. The image of this functor consists of finite dimensional modules. We also would like to point out that $Q^\circ \subset P$ and so we may assume that $Q^\circ \subset R$.

We remark that this functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ is a generalization of $\mathbb{V}$ in the case when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$.

6.2.2. *Properties of* $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. Our goal here is to see that all results mentioned in Theorem 4.6 with exception of (iv) – although see a remark below – still hold for $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$.

(ii) is a general property of $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ established in 4.1.4. (iii) does not have much content. As for (iv), $\dim \Delta_P(\mu)_{\dagger,e} = \dim L_0(\mu)$, where $L_0(\mu)$ denotes the finite dimensional irreducible module for the Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$ with highest weight $\mu - \rho$. This is again a general property of $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. We remark however that there should be an alternative description of $\Delta_P(\mu)_{\dagger,e}$. Namely, recall a dimension preserving exact functor $\varsigma : U(\mathfrak{l})\text{-mod}_{f.d} \to \mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R_{f.d}$. One should be able to prove (tracking the definition of ς) that $\Delta_P(\mu)_{\dagger,e} = \varsigma(L_0(\mu))$.

Let us proceed to (i). Since Pe is a dense orbit in $\mathfrak{p}^\perp$ the functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ kills precisely the modules with non-maximal GK dimension. The proofs that $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ is a quotient onto its image and that the image is closed under taking subquotients closely follow that for $\mathbb{V}$ (in the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0$): we again use the Bernstein-Gelfand equivalence together with the general properties of $\bullet$. We use the notation of the corresponding part of the proof of Proposition 4.2.

The only difference with that proof is that $\dim \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{J}_\dagger$ may be different from 1. More precisely, for the same reason as in that proof, $\dim \mathcal{W}/\mathcal{J}_\dagger$ equals the multiplicity of $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{J}$ on $\mathbb{O}$ that coincides with the generic degree of the map $T^*(G/P) \to \overline{\mathbb{O}}$. The latter equals $|Q/R|$.

But R is definitely contained in the stabilizer of the (still 1-dimensional) module $\Delta_P(\rho)_{\dagger,e}$ in Q. Since $\mathcal{J}_\dagger$ coincides with the intersection of the Q-translates of $\mathcal{I} := \operatorname{Ann}_{\mathcal{W}} \Delta_P(\nu+\rho)_{\dagger,e}$, we see that the stabilizer is exactly R. It follows that the functor $X \mapsto X \otimes_{\mathcal{W}} \Delta_P(\nu+\rho)_{\dagger,e}$ is an equivalence from the category of Q-equivariant finite dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-bimodules annihilated by $\mathcal{I}$ from the right to the category of finite dimensional R-equivariant $\mathcal{W}$-modules. This observation finishes the proof of (i) in this case. So our functor is equivalent to the one studied by Stroppel, [St1],[St2].

An analog of (vi) is a consequence of the argument in the previous paragraph and the classification results from [LO].

Let us proceed to (vii). Proposition 4.3 still holds in the present situation, there we only used the definition of $\mathbb{V}$ as $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. In its turn, that proposition is the only nontrivial ingredient in the proof of (vii) in 4.3.3.

The proof of (viii) carries over to the present situation verbatim.

Finally, let us make a remark regarding (v). To make sense of (v) one needs an involutive antiautomorphism τ of $\mathfrak{g}$ with $\tau(P)$ being an opposite parabolic of P, $\tau(e) = e, \tau(f) = f$. It seems very likely that such τ exists but we did not care to prove this. Then one needs to retell the proof in 4.2.3 using only the definition of $\mathbb{V}$ as $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$.

6.2.3. *The orbit codimension condition in type A.* We would like to analyze the condition $\operatorname{codim}_{\mathfrak{p}^\perp} \mathfrak{p}^\perp \setminus Pe > 1$ in the case when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n$. In this case a version of $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ was previously considered by Brundan and Kleshchev in [BK1],[BK2]. A special feature of type A is that any nilpotent element admits a so called *good even grading.* Then one can replace $\mathfrak{g}(i)$ with the ith graded component with respect to this grading. All constructions of Sections 3,4 work for that modification. Brundan and Kleshchev studied the Whittaker coinvariant functor, which is just $\mathbb{V}_2$ in this special case. So our approach recovers many results from [BK1],[BK2].

Parabolic subalgebras in $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ are parameterized by compositions of n, i.e., ordered collections of positive integers summing to n. So let $\mathfrak{p}$ correspond to a composition $(s_1, \ldots, s_\ell)$. Brundan and Kleshchev checked that the Whittaker coinvariants functor is 0-faithful provided $s_1 > s_2 > \ldots > s_\ell$. The following proposition together with the previous subsection generalizes that.

Proposition 6.1. *Let e be a Richardson element for P. The condition* $\operatorname{codim}_{\mathfrak{p}^\perp} \mathfrak{p}^\perp \setminus Pe > 1$ *is equivalent to all s's being distinct.*

Proof. Suppose that all s_i's are distinct. We are going to prove that for any nilpotent orbit $\mathbb{O}' \subset \overline{\mathbb{O}}$ (this condition is necessary for $\mathbb{O}'$ to intersect $\mathfrak{p}^\perp$), we have $\dim \mathbb{O}' < \dim \mathbb{O} - 2$. Since $\dim \mathbb{O}' \cap \mathfrak{p}^\perp \leqslant \dim \mathbb{O}' \cap \mathfrak{b}^\perp = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathbb{O}$, see, for instance, [McG2] for the last equality, the inequality $\dim \mathbb{O}' < \dim \mathbb{O} - 2$ implies $\dim \mathbb{O}' \cap \mathfrak{p}^\perp < \dim \mathfrak{p}^\perp - 1$. The number of nilpotent orbits is finite and so the previous inequality implies the required codimension condition.

Let λ be the Young diagram with rows of lengths $s_1, \ldots, s_\ell$ ordered in the decreasing order. Then $\mathbb{O}$ is the orbit corresponding to the transposed diagram λ^t. We have $\dim \mathbb{O} = n^2 - \sum_i \lambda_i^2$. Now let μ be a Young diagram such that μ^t corresponds to $\mathbb{O}'$. The condition $\mathbb{O}' \subset \overline{\mathbb{O}}$ is equivalent to $\lambda \leqslant \mu$ in the dominance ordering, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i$ for all k. In other words, there is a sequence $\lambda^0 := \lambda, \lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^m := \mu$ such that λ^i is obtained from λ^{i-1} by moving a box from a shorter row to a longer row. It is therefore enough to consider the case when $\mu = \lambda^1$. We need to show that $\sum_i \mu_i^2 \geqslant \sum_i \lambda_i^2 + 4$. There are indexes $p < q$

such that $\mu_i = \lambda_i$ if $i \neq p, q$, $\mu_p = \lambda_p + 1, \mu_q = \lambda_q - 1$. We have

$$\sum_i (\mu_i^2 - \lambda_i^2) = (\lambda_p + 1)^2 - \lambda_p^2 + (\lambda_q - 1)^2 - \lambda_q^2 = 2(\lambda_p - \lambda_q) + 2.$$

Since $\lambda_p > \lambda_q$ by our assumption, we see that $2(\lambda_p - \lambda_q) + 2 \geqslant 4$, and we are done.

Now let us consider the situation when there are two equal elements: $s_p = s_q$ with $p < q$. We will write matrices in a block form: $A = (A_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{\ell}$ with the (i, j)-block of size $s_i \times s_j$ so that $\mathfrak{p}^\perp$ consists of all matrices A with $A_{ij} = 0$ if $i \geqslant j$. The matrix $\prod_{i=p}^{q-1} A_{ii+1}$ has size $s_p \times s_q$, in particular this is a square matrix. So we can consider the polynomial $f(A) = \det(\prod_{i=p}^{q-1} A_{ii+1})$. Clearly, this polynomial is nonzero and it is semiinvariant with respect to the P-action on $\mathfrak{p}^\perp$. Its subvariety of zeroes is therefore a P-stable divisor that has to lie in the complement of Pe. So the codimension under consideration is 1. $\square$

The 0-faithfulness of the Brundan-Kleshchev functor was a crucial ingredient in the proof of an equivalence between (the sum of certain blocks) of $\mathcal{O}^P$ and a category $\mathcal{O}$ for a suitable cyclotomic Rational Cherednik algebra in [GL, Theorem 6.9.1] (under the restriction that $s_1 > \ldots > s_\ell$). Using Proposition 6.1 one should be able to remove that restriction but we are not going to elaborate on this.

6.3. **Dixmier algebras.**

6.3.1. *Functor* $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$. By a Dixmier algebra one means a G-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ equipped with a G-equivariant homomorphism $\mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{A}$ that makes $\mathcal{A}$ into a Harish-Chandra bimodule such that the differential of the G-action on $\mathcal{A}$ coincides with the adjoint $\mathfrak{g}$-action. The algebra $\mathcal{U}$ itself as well as any quotient of $\mathcal{U}$ serve as examples of Dixmier algebras. Two more examples come from Lie superalgebras and from quantum groups at roots of 1, they are considered below. It is basically those two families of examples that motivate us to consider arbitrary Dixmier algebras.

Let K be as in 4.1.1. Let $\mathcal{O}^K_\nu(\mathcal{A})$ denote the category of $\mathcal{A}$-modules that lie in $\mathcal{O}^K_\nu$ as $\mathcal{U}$-modules.

Fix a good algebra filtration $\mathrm{F}_\bullet \mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{A}$, where, recall, *good* means that all $\mathrm{F}_i \mathcal{A}$ are G-stable and $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{A}$ is a finitely generated $S(\mathfrak{g}) = \operatorname{gr} \mathcal{U}$-module. The existence of a good *algebra* filtration is checked, for example, in [Lo2, Proof of Proposition 3.4.5]. In addition, we can assume that $\mathrm{F}_0 \mathcal{A} = \mathrm{F}_1 \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{K}$ and that $\mathrm{F}_2 \mathcal{A}$ contains the image of $\mathfrak{g}$. This insures that we have a graded algebra homomorphism $S(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathcal{A}$. Consider the corresponding Rees algebra $\mathcal{A}_\hbar := \bigoplus_{i=0}^\infty (\mathrm{F}_i \mathcal{A})\hbar^i$. This is a graded algebra, where $\hbar$ has degree 1. The corresponding $\mathcal{W}$-bimodule $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$ has a natural algebra structure, see [Lo2, Subsection 3.4].

Pick $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}^K_\nu(\mathcal{A})$. The R-equivariant $\mathcal{W}$-module $\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$ has a natural $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-module structure. So we get an exact functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e} : \mathcal{O}^K_\nu(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathcal{A}_\dagger\text{-mod}^R_\nu$. We have the forgetful functors $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{O}^K_\nu(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathcal{O}^K_\nu$, $\mathcal{A}\,\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathcal{A}_\dagger\text{-mod}^R \to \mathcal{W}\text{-mod}^R$ and they intertwine the functors $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$, i.e., $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{W}}(\bullet_{\dagger,e}) = \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathcal{U}}(\bullet)_{\dagger,e}$.

Let us make an observation that will be used later. There is a functor $\bullet^{\dagger,e} : \mathcal{A}_\dagger\text{-mod}^R \to \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^K_\nu(\mathcal{A})$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^K_\nu(\mathcal{A})$ is a category of not necessarily finitely generated $\mathcal{A}$-modules that are inductive limits of objects in $\mathcal{O}^K_\nu(\mathcal{A})$. This functor satisfies $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}^{\dagger,e}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}_\dagger,R}(\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}, \mathcal{N})$. The functor is constructed completely analogously to $\bullet^{\dagger,e}$ in 4.1.4 and, in particular, does not depend on $\mathcal{A}$ in the sense that the functors $\bullet^{\dagger,e}$ for $\mathcal{A}$ and for $\mathcal{U}$ are again intertwined by the forgetful functors.

6.3.2. *Enveloping algebras of Lie superalgebras.* Here is an interesting example of a Dixmier algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ be a simple classical Lie superalgebra or a queer Lie superalgebra. In particular, the even part, denote it by $\mathfrak{g}$, is a reductive Lie algebra. So the universal enveloping (super)algebra $\mathcal{A} := U(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ is a Dixmier algebra over $\mathcal{U} = U(\mathfrak{g})$. We also remark that $\mathcal{A}$ is a free left (or right) module over $\mathcal{U}$.

The algebra $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$ may be thought as a W-algebra for the Lie superalgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. It should not be difficult to check that $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$ is isomorphic to the Clifford algebra over the super W-algebras studied previously, see, for example, [Z],[BBG]. But we are not going to prove this here.

6.3.3. *Quantum groups at roots of 1.* Here we will show that the algebra that is basically the Lusztig form of a quantum group at a root of unity is a Dixmier algebra. More precisely we will show that the quantum Frobenius epimorphism splits.

Let us recall some generalities on quantum groups. We follow [Lu4].

We fix a Cartan matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ of finite type. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the corresponding finite dimensional semisimple Lie algebra. Let $D = \operatorname{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ be the matrix with coprime entries $d_i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that DA is symmetric. Let v be an indeterminate. We write $[n]_{d_i}$ for the quantum integer $\frac{v^{d_i n} - v^{-d_i n}}{v^{d_i} - v^{-d_i}}$ and $[n]_{d_i}!$ for the corresponding quantum factorial. We then consider the quantum group $U_v(\mathfrak{g})$ that is a $\mathbb{K}(v)$-algebra generated by $E_i, F_i, K_i^{\pm 1}$ in a standard way, see, e.g., [Lu4, Section 1]. Inside we consider the $\mathbb{K}[v^{\pm 1}]$-subalgebra $\dot{U}_v(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by the divided powers $E_i^{(N)} := \frac{E_i^N}{[N]_{d_i}!}$ and $F_i^{(N)} := \frac{F_i^N}{[N]_{d_i}!}$ and also $K_i^{\pm 1}$. It contains elements

$$\binom{K_i; c}{t} := \prod_{i=1}^{t} \frac{K_i v^{d_i(c-s+1)} - K_i^{-1} v^{-d_i(c-s+1)}}{v^{d_i s} - v^{-d_i s}},$$

see [Lu4, Section 6]. Inside $\dot{U}_v(\mathfrak{g})$ we consider subalgebras $\dot{U}_v^+$, (resp., $\dot{U}_v^-$ and $\dot{U}_v^0$) generated by the elements $E_i^{(N)}$ (resp., $F_i^{(N)}$, and $K_i^{\pm 1}$, $\binom{K_i;c}{t}$). We have the triangular decomposition $\dot{U}_v(\mathfrak{g}) = \dot{U}_v^+ \otimes \dot{U}_0^+ \otimes \dot{U}_v^-$.

Pick an integer ℓ that is odd and, in the case when $\mathfrak{g}$ has a component of type G_2, coprime to 3. Let ϵ be an ℓth primitive root of 1. Let $\dot{U}_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g}), \dot{U}_\epsilon^+$ etc. denote the specializations of the corresponding algebras at $v = \epsilon$. The elements K_i^ℓ are central in $\dot{U}_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ and, moreover, one can show that $K_i^{2\ell} = 1$ in $\dot{U}_\epsilon^0$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the quotient of $\dot{U}_\epsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ by K_i^ℓ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We still have the triangular decomposition $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^- \otimes \mathcal{A}^0 \otimes \mathcal{A}^+$, and $\mathcal{A}^- = \dot{U}^+(\mathfrak{g}), \mathcal{A}^+ = \dot{U}^-(\mathfrak{g})$. In fact, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}^+$ is generated just by the elements $E_i, E_i^{(\ell)}$ and a similar claim holds for $\mathcal{A}^-$.

Also we have an epimorphism $\mathrm{Fr}^* : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{U}$ called the *quantum Frobenius epimorphism*, see [Lu4, Section 8]. By construction, it maps $E_i^{(N)}, F_i^{(N)}$ to $e_i^{(N/\ell)}, f_i^{(N/\ell)}$ if N is divisible by ℓ and to 0 else, and it sends K_i to 1. Further, it maps $\binom{K_i;0}{\ell}$ to h_i.

Our goal is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 6.2. *There is a monomorphism $\iota : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{A}$ that is a section of* Fr*, meaning that* $\mathrm{Fr} \circ \iota = \mathrm{id}$. *Moreover, $\mathcal{A}$ becomes a Dixmier algebra with respect to this homomorphism. Finally, $\mathcal{A}$ is free over $\iota(\mathcal{U})$.*

The proof of this proposition occupies the remainder of this subsection. First of all, let $\mathbf{u}$ denote the small quantum group, the subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}$ generated by $K_i, E_i, F_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$. For $u \in \mathbf{u}$ set $\delta_i(u) := E_i^{(\ell)} u - u E_i^{(\ell)}, \delta_i'(u) := F_i^{(\ell)} u - u F_i^{(\ell)}$. It turns out, see [Lu4, Section 8], that $\delta_i(u), \delta_i'(u) \in \mathbf{u}$ and so δ_i, δ_i' are derivations of $\mathbf{u}$.

Also Lusztig in loc.cit. proved that the map $e_i \mapsto E_i^{(\ell)}$ extends to an algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{U}^+ \to \mathcal{A}^+$ and a similar claim is true for $\mathcal{U}^-$ and $\mathcal{A}^-$.

Consider the Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{n}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of all elements $x \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[x, \mathbf{u}] \subset \mathbf{u}$. Of course, $\mathbf{u}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{n}$, and $E_i^{(\ell)}, F_i^{(\ell)} \in \mathfrak{n}$.

The following lemma is crucial in the proof of Proposition 6.2.

Lemma 6.3. *The assignment* $e_i \mapsto E_i^{(\ell)}, f_i \mapsto F_i^{(\ell)}, h_i \mapsto \binom{K_i;0}{\ell}$ *extends to a Lie algebra homomorphism* $\mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{n}/\mathbf{u}$.

Proof. The Serre relations hold even in $\mathfrak{n}$ thanks to results of Lusztig quoted above. The relations of the form $[E_i^{(\ell)}, F_j^{(\ell)}] = 0$ for $i \neq j$ again hold in $\mathfrak{n}$. The same is true for the commutation relation between the elements $\binom{K_i;0}{\ell}$. The relation $[E_i^{(\ell)}, F_i^{(\ell)}] = \binom{K_i;0}{\ell}$ holds in $\mathfrak{n}/\mathbf{u}$ thanks to [Lu4, Section 8, (a2)]. So it remains to check that $[\binom{K_i,0}{\ell}, E_j^{(\ell)}] = a_{ij}E_j^{(\ell)}, [\binom{K_i,0}{\ell}, F_j^{(\ell)}] = -a_{ij}F_j^{(\ell)}$ in $\mathfrak{n}/\mathbf{u}$. We will prove the relations for in the case of $E_j^{(\ell)}$, the case of $F_j^{(\ell)}$ is analogous.

(a5) in loc.cit. says that

$$\binom{K_i;0}{\ell} E_j^{(\ell)} = E_j^{(\ell)} \binom{K_i; a_{ij}\ell}{\ell}.$$

So we need to prove that $\binom{K_i;c}{\ell} = \binom{K_i;c+\ell}{\ell} + 1$ in $\mathcal{A}^0$ for all c. According to [Lu4, Section 6, (b4)] we have

$$\binom{K_i; c+\ell}{\ell} - \binom{K_i;c}{\ell} = \sum_{t=0}^{\ell-1} v^{-d_i(c+t+1)} K_i^{-1} \binom{K_i; c+t}{\ell-1}$$

in U_v^0. Since $K_i^\ell = 1$ in $\mathcal{A}$, we need to check that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\ell-1} \epsilon^{-d_i(c+t+1)} \epsilon^{-x} \prod_{s=1}^{\ell-1} (\epsilon^x \epsilon^{d_i(c+t-s+1)} - \epsilon^{-x}\epsilon^{-d_i(c+t-s+1)}) = 1$$

for any $x = 0, 1, \ldots, \ell-1$. In the proof we may change x and ϵ and assume that $d_i = 1$ and $c = 0$. Then the product

$$\prod_{s=1}^{\ell-1} (\epsilon^x \epsilon^{d_i(c+t-s+1)} - \epsilon^{-x}\epsilon^{-d_i(c+t-s+1)})$$

is nonzero only if $x + t + 1$ is divisible by ℓ. The corresponding summand is 1. This checks the remaining relations. $\square$

Since $\mathfrak{g}$ is semisimple, any homomorphism $\mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{n}/\mathbf{u}$ lifts to a Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{n}$ and so to an algebra homomorphism $\iota : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{A}$. We have $\mathrm{Fr} \circ \iota(x) - x \in \mathbb{K}$ for $x = e_i, f_i, h_i$, which implies that the difference is actually 0. Also, since $\iota(e_i) - E_i^{(\ell)}, \iota(f_i) - F_i^{(\ell)}, \iota(h_i) - \binom{K_i;0}{\ell} \in \mathbf{u}$ and $E_i^{(\ell)}, F_i^{(\ell)}, \binom{K_i;0}{\ell}$ normalize $\mathbf{u}$, we see that $\mathcal{A}$ is generated by $\mathbf{u}$ as a left (or right) $\mathcal{U}$-module, while the adjoint $\mathfrak{g}$-action on $\mathcal{A}$ is locally finite. So $\mathcal{A}$ is a Dixmier algebra. The same argument shows that $\mathcal{A}$ is free over $\iota(\mathcal{U})$.

6.3.4. *Category $\mathcal{O}^P(\mathcal{A})$ and functor $\mathbb{V}$.* Here we consider a Dixmier algebra $\mathcal{A}$ that is free over $\mathcal{U}$. In both examples we have considered above the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ has this property. Further, we take P, e, h, f as in the main body of the paper (but we also can take them as in Subsection 6.2). Then we have the functor $\bullet_{\dagger,e} : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathcal{A}, e)^R_\nu$, where the target category is the category of all R-equivariant $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-modules that lie in $\mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_\nu$.

Recall that the forgetful functors $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{O}^P_\nu(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathcal{O}^P_\nu$ and $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathcal{A}, e)^R_\nu \to \mathcal{O}^\theta(\mathfrak{g}, e)^R_\nu$ intertwine both $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ and its right adjoint functor $\bullet^{\dagger,e}$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{W}(\bullet_{\dagger,e}) = \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}(\bullet)_{\dagger,e}, \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}(\bullet^{\dagger,e}) = \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{W}(\bullet)^{\dagger,e}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}\left((\bullet_{\dagger,e})^{\dagger,e}\right) = (\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}(\bullet)_{\dagger,e})^{\dagger,e}. \tag{6.1}$$

It follows that $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ is still a quotient functor onto its image annihilating precisely the modules with non-maximal GK dimension. Also the image is closed under taking subquotients.

Now let us prove that $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ has the double centralizer property. The right adjoint functor to $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}$, that is $\operatorname{Hom}_\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A}, \bullet)$, is exact because, by our assumption, $\mathcal{A}$ is a free $\mathcal{U}$-module. So if P is a projective $\mathcal{A}$-module, then $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}(P)$ is a projective $\mathcal{U}$-module. Thanks to (6.1), the morphism $P \to (P_{\dagger,e})^{\dagger,e}$ does not depend on whether we consider P as a $\mathcal{A}$-module or as a $\mathcal{U}$-module. This yields the double centralizer property.

6.3.5. *Classification of finite dimensional irreducibles for $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$.* Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-module. Then $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{M})$ has finite length. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a HC $\mathcal{U}$-bimodule, we see that all generalized central characters appearing in $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{M})$ have integral difference. In particular, the categories $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu(\mathcal{A}, e)$ contain all finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-modules.

Proposition 6.4. *Every finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-module $\mathcal{N}$ with integral central character occurs as a direct summand in $\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$ for some irreducible $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}^P(\mathcal{A})$ with $\mathrm{V}(\mathcal{U}/\operatorname{Ann}_\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{M})) = \overline{\mathbb{O}}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N}^1 \subset \mathcal{N}$ be an irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-submodule. It occurs as a direct summand in $\mathcal{N}^1_{\dagger,e}$ for some irreducible $\mathcal{M}^1 \in \mathcal{O}^P$ with the associated variety condition as above. Set $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} := \mathcal{A} \otimes_\mathcal{U} \mathcal{M}$, this is an object of $\mathcal{O}^P(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\dagger,e} = \mathcal{A}_\dagger \otimes_\mathcal{W} \mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$. In particular, $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \otimes_\mathcal{W} \mathcal{N}^1$ is a direct summand in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\dagger,e}$. But $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \otimes_\mathcal{W} \mathcal{N}_1 \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{N}$. So $\mathcal{N}$ is a subquotient of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\dagger,e}$. Since $\bullet_{\dagger,e}$ is a quotient functor, we see that $\mathcal{N}$ is a direct summand of a composition factor of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\dagger,e}$. □

Now suppose that we know the classification of the irreducibles in $\mathcal{O}^P_\nu(\mathcal{A})$ with maximal GK dimension. If the group R is connected, then the classification of finite dimensional irreducible $\mathcal{W}$-modules follows from Proposition 6.4. Otherwise it becomes a non-trivial problem (basically solved in [LO] for $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{U}$). Let us also make a comment on the integral central character restriction. It is only needed to make sure that $\mathcal{N}^1$ appears as a summand in some $\mathcal{M}^1_{\dagger,e}$.

Consider the quantum group case in more detail. Here we know the classification of modules with maximal GK dimension in $\mathcal{O}^P(\mathcal{A})$. In that case they have the form $L \otimes \operatorname{Fr}^*(\mathcal{M})$, where $\mathcal{M}$ is the module with maximal GK dimension in $\mathcal{O}^P$ and L is a restricted finite dimensional representation of $\mathcal{A}$, see [Lu3] and also [AM]. In the latter paper the category $\mathcal{O}^B(\mathcal{A})$ was studied in detail.

We can form tensor products of $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-modules with finite dimensional $\mathcal{A}$-modules: $L \otimes \bullet := (L \otimes \mathcal{A})_\dagger \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_\dagger} \bullet$. Here, on $L \otimes \mathcal{A}$, the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ acts on the right in a naive way and on the left via the coproduct $\Delta : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ (recall that $\mathcal{A}$ was a quotient of the quantum group but the ideal we mod out is easily seen to be a Hopf ideal). The epimorphism $\mathrm{Fr}^* : \mathcal{A} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{U}$ induces an epimorphism $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{U}$ again denoted by Fr^*.

Lemma 6.5. *Let L be a restricted finite dimensional $\mathcal{A}$-module and $\mathcal{N}^1$ be an irreducible finite dimensional $\mathcal{W}$-module with integral central character. Then the $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-module $L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{N}^1)$ is semisimple. Moreover, for any irreducible $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-module $\mathcal{N}$ with integral central character there $L, \mathcal{N}^1$ as above such that $\mathcal{N}$ is a direct summand of $L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{N}^1)$.*

Proof. The module $\mathcal{N}^1$ is a direct summand in $\mathcal{M}^1_{\dagger,e}$ for some irreducible $\mathcal{M}^1 \in \mathcal{O}^P$ of the maximal GK dimension. The module $\mathcal{M} := L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{M}^1)$ is an irreducible object in $\mathcal{O}^P(\mathcal{A})$. So $(L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{M}^1))_{\dagger,e} = L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{M}^1_{\dagger,e})$ is irreducible as an R-equivariant $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-module. In particular, it is completely reducible as an $\mathcal{A}_\dagger$-module. But $L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{N}^1)$ is a direct summand in $L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{M}^1_{\dagger,e})$ and so the semi-simplicity claim is proved. Since any simple $\mathcal{A}$-module $\mathcal{N}$ with integral central character appears as a direct summand in the module of the form $\mathcal{M}_{\dagger,e}$ the second claim of the proposition follows from the fact mentioned above that any simple object in $\mathcal{O}^P(\mathcal{A})$ has the form $L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{M}^1)$. ☐

We do not know whether $L \otimes \mathrm{Fr}^*(\mathcal{N}^1)$ is irreducible, in general.

References

[AM] H.H. Andersen, V. Mazorchuk. *Category $\mathcal{O}$ for quantum groups.* arXiv:1105.5500.

[A] L.V. Antonyan, *On the classification of homogeneous elements of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded semisimple Lie algebras.* Vestn. Mosk. Univ., Ser. 1, 1982, 29-34 (in Russian). English translation in: Mosc. Univ. Math. Bull. 37 (1982), 36-43.

[BV] D. Barbash, D. Vogan. *Unipotent representations.* Ann. Math. 121(1985), 41-110.

[BG] J. Bernstein, S. Gelfand. *Tensor products of finite and infinite dimensional representations of semisimple Lie algebras.* Compositio Mathematica, 41(1980), n.2, p. 245-285.

[BFO] R. Bezrukavnikov, M. Finkelberg, V. Ostrik, *On tensor categories attached to cells in affine Weyl groups, III.* Israel J. Math. 170(2009), 207-234.

[BM] R. Bezrukavnikov, I. Mirkovic. *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in prime characteristic and noncommutative Springer resolution.* arXiv:1001.2562.

[Br] J. Brundan. *Moeglin's theorem and Goldie rank polynomials in Cartan type A.* arXiv:1010.0640.

[BBG] J. Brown, J. Brundan, S. Goodwin. *Principal W-algebras for* $\mathrm{GL}(m|n)$. arXiv:1205.0992.

[BGK] J. Brundan, S. Goodwin, A. Kleshchev. *Highest weight theory for finite W-algebras.* IMRN 2008, no. 15, Art. ID rnn051; arXiv:0801.1337.

[BK1] J. Brundan, A. Kleshchev. *Representations of shifted Yangians and finite W-algebras.* Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 196 (2008), 107 pp.

[BK2] J. Brundan, A. Kleshchev. *Schur-Weyl duality for higher levels.* Selecta Math., 14(2008), 1-57.

[CM] D. Collingwood, W. McGovern. *Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras.* Chapman and Hall, London, 1993.

[Gi] V. Ginzburg. *Harish-Chandra bimodules for quantized Slodowy slices. Harish-Chandra bimodules for quantized Slodowy slices*, Repres. Theory 13(2009), 236-271.

[GGOR] V. Ginzburg, N. Guay, E. Opdam and R. Rouquier, *On the category $\mathcal{O}$ for rational Cherednik algebras*, Invent. Math., **154** (2003), 617-651.

[GL] I. Gordon, I. Losev, *On category $\mathcal{O}$ for cyclotomic Rational Cherednik algebras.* arXiv:1109.2315.

[Ja] J.C. Jantzen. *Einhüllende Algebren halbeinfacher Lie-Algebren.* Ergebnisse der Math., Vol. 3, Springer, New York, Tokio etc., 1983.

[Jo1] A. Joseph. *Goldie rank in the enveloping algebra of a semisimple Lie algebra, I.* J. Algebra 65(1980), 269-283.

[Jo2] A. Joseph. *Goldie rank in the enveloping algebra of a semisimple Lie algebra, II.* J. Algebra 65(1980), 284-306.

[Jo3] A. Joseph. *On the cyclicity of vectors associated with Duflo involutions.* in Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1243, 144-188, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.

[Jo3] A. Joseph. *On the associated variety of a primitive ideal.* J. Algebra, 93(1985), 509-523.

[Jo4] A. Joseph. *A sum rule for the scale factors in the Goldie rank polynomials.* J. Algebra, 118(1988), 276-311.

[Lo1] I. Losev. *Quantized symplectic actions and W-algebras.* J. Amer. Math. Soc 23(2010), 34-59.

[Lo2] I. Losev. *Finite dimensional representations of W-algebras.* Duke Math. J. 159(2011), n.1, 99-143.

[Lo3] I. Losev. *On the structure of the category $\mathcal{O}$ for W-algebras.* Séminaires et Congrès 25(2010), 351-368. arXiv:0812.1584.

[Lo4] I. Losev. *Parabolic induction and one-dimensional representations of W-algebras.* Adv. Math. 226(2011), 6, 4841-4883.

[Lo5] I. Losev. *Primitive ideals in W-algebras of type A.* J. Algebra, 359 (2012), 80-88.

[LO] I. Losev, V. Ostrik. *Classification of finite dimensional irreducible modules over W-algebras.* arXiv:1202.6097.

[Lu1] G. Lusztig. *Characters of reductive groups over a finite field*, Ann. Math. Studies 107, Princeton University Press (1984).

[Lu2] G. Lusztig. *Leading coefficients of character values of Hecke algebras*, Proc.Symp.Pure Math.47(2), Amer.Math.Soc. 1987, 235-262.

[Lu3] G. Lusztig. *Modular representations and quantum groups.* in "Classical groups and related topics" (Bejing, 1987), Contemp. Math. 82(1989), 59-77.

[Lu4] G. Lusztig. *Quantum groups at roots of* 1. Geom. Dedicata, 35(1990), 89-114.

[LS] G. Lusztig, N. Spaltenstein. *Induced unipotent classes.* J. London Math. Soc. (2), 19(1979), 41-52.

[McG1] W. McGovern. *Completely prime maximal ideals and quantization.* Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 519(1994).

[McG2] W. McGovern. *The adjoint representation and the adjoint action.* Encyclopaedia of mathematical sciences, 131. Invariant theory and algebraic transformation groups, II, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2002.

[Mo] C. Moeglin, *Modèles de Whittaker et idéaux primitifs complètement premiers dans les algèbres enveloppantes II*, Math. Scand. 63 (1988), 5-35.

[Pr1] A. Premet. *Special transverse slices and their enveloping algebras.* Adv. Math. 170(2002), 1-55.

[Pr2] A. Premet. *Enveloping algebras of Slodowy slices and the Joseph ideal.* J. Eur. Math. Soc, 9(2007), N3, 487-543.

[Pr3] A. Premet, *Enveloping algebras of Slodowy slices and Goldie rank.* arXiv:1009.3229.

[So] W. Soergel. *Kategorie $\mathcal{O}$, perverse Garben und Moduln den Koinvarianten zur Weyl-grouppe.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 3(1990), 421-445.

[St1] C. Stroppel: *Der Kombinatorikfunktor $\mathbb{V}$: Graduierte Kategorie $\mathcal{O}$, Hauptserien und primitive Ideale*, Dissertation Universität Freiburg i. Br. (2001).

[St2] C. Stroppel. *Category $\mathcal{O}$: quivers and endomorphisms of projectives.* Repres. Theory, 7(2003), 322-345.

[W] R.B. Warfield. *Prime ideals in ring extensions.* J. London Math. Soc. 28(1983), 453-460.

[Z] L. Zhao. *Finite W-superalgebras for queer Lie algebras.* arXiv:1012.2326.

Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University, Boston MA 02115 USA
E-mail address: `i.loseu@neu.edu`